National Library of Canada
Acquisitions and Bibliographic Services Branch
395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada
Direction des acquisitions et des services bibliographiques
395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Your file *Votre référence*

Our file *Notre référence*

NOTICE

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30, and subsequent amendments.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30, et ses amendements subséquents.

Canada

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

THE EARLY STAGES OF AN INNOVATION: SCHOOL-BASED STAFF DEVELOPMENT IN STRATHCONA COUNTY

BY

JOAN LESLIE SOUSTER

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research in partial fulfillment for the requirements for the Degree of Master of Education

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

FALL 1992

National Library of Canada
Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

Canadian Theses Service
Service des thèses canadiennes

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

The author has granted an irrevocable non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of his/her thesis by any means and in any form or format, making this thesis available to interested persons.

L'auteur a accordé une licence irrévocable et non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de sa thèse de quelque manière et sous quelque forme que ce soit pour mettre des exemplaires de cette thèse à la disposition des personnes intéressées.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in his/her thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her permission.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège sa thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

ISBN 0-315-77261-1

Canada

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

RELEASE FORM

NAME OF AUTHOR: Joan Leslie Souster.

TITLE OF THESIS: The Early Stages of an Innovation:
School-Based Staff Development in
Strathcona County.

DEGREE: Master of Education.

YEAR THIS DEGREE GRANTED: Fall, 1992.

Permission is hereby granted to the University of Alberta Library to reproduce single copies of this thesis and to lend or sell such copies for private, scholarly or scientific research purposes only.

The author reserves all other publication and other rights in association with the copyright in the thesis, and except as hereinbefore provided neither the thesis nor any substantial portion thereof may be printed or otherwise reproduced in any material form whatever without the author's prior written permission.

Joan Leslie Souster

105 Main Boulevard
Sherwood Park, AB.
T8A 2H1

October 8,1992.

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research for acceptance, a thesis entitled The Early Stages of an Innovation: School-Based Staff Development in Strathcona County submitted by Joan Leslie Souster in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Education.

Dr. D. A. MacKay (Supervisor)

Dr. K. L. Ward

Dr. J. G. Paterson

This thesis is dedicated to the love of my life, my husband, Darrell.

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to describe the early stages of the implementation of an innovation, school-based staff development. The researcher describes the process as lead teachers participated in the *Leadership in Staff Development Program* and worked with their respective staffs to initiate school-based staff development plans in their schools. The perceptions of the lead teachers with respect to the use of the skills they acquired in the training program and their roles as facilitators in their schools, as well as the perceptions of teachers in the schools participating in the program are described. The study also provides an indication of the levels of use of the innovation.

Data were collected over a ten month period using participant observation and structured, in-depth interviews. The researcher conducted eighteen arranged interviews with administrators and teachers and attended three half days of teacher training sessions as a participant observer.

The findings of the study reveal that the respondents perceived the implementation of school-based

staff development as a positive way in which to meet the professional development needs of teachers. The participants in the pilot program also formed staff development committees and developed school-based staff development plans for their schools. The plans were found to differ in content and approach. The levels of use of the innovation differed among administrators, teachers and schools with the greatest differences found in the larger schools.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank Dr. Al MacKay for his humor, support and assistance during the writing of this thesis. Thanks are also extended to Dr. Ken Ward and Dr. John Paterson for serving as committee members.

I wish to thank the Strathcona County Board of Education for providing me with a sabbatical leave to pursue my studies and for giving me permission to conduct the study. I would also like to thank the teachers, administrators and central office staff of Strathcona County who gave of their valuable time to help with the research.

I express my appreciation to Mr. Gordon Welch, Superintendent, Strathcona County Board of Education and Mr. Carl Carlson, Principal, Salisbury Composite High School for their support and encouragement.

Finally I would like to thank my family, my husband, Darrell, my daughters, Allyson and Kerrie and my grandson, Taylor for their love and encouragement.

Table of Contents

Chapter Page

I. Introduction 1

Purpose of the Study 6

Problem 7

Significance of the Study 8

II. Review of the Literature 10

III. Design of the Study 17

Research Design 18

Data Collection.....20

Data Analysis.....22

IV. The Results 23

Leadership in Professional Staff Development - Level One 23

Discussion 29

Analysis of Interview Responses 31

Knowledge of the Leadership in Professional Development Program 31

Comparison of School-Based Staff Development to the Existing Staff Development Program ..34

Discussion 37

Reasons for the Implementation of the Program 39

Discussion 43

The Meaning of the Program to Individual Teachers 44

Discussion 48

Awareness of the Implementation of School-Based Staff Development 49

Discussion 52

Perceptions of the Time Involved to Implement School-Based Staff Development 53

Discussion 56

Concerns Regarding the Program 57

Discussion 62

Planning With Regard to the Program 63

Discussion 66

Reasons to Terminate the Program 67

Discussion 71

Other Results 72

Discussion 87

Determination of Levels of Use of the Program 93

School A 96

Discussion 97

School B 98

Discussion 101

School C 102

Discussion 104

School D 105

Discussion 107

Summary 109

V. Summary, Recommendations, Possibilities for Further Research and Conclusions 112

Summary 113

Leadership in Professional Development - Level One 113

Summary of Responses to Interview Questions 114

Other Results 118

Levels of Use of the Program 120

Recommendations 122

Possibilities for Further Research 124

Conclusion 126

Bibliography 128

Appendix A: Interview Questions 137

Appendix B: Covering Letter for the Study 139

Appendix C: Covering Letter to the Principals...141

Appendix D: Sample Interview Script 143

Chapter I

INTRODUCTION

In 1989 Strathcona County Board of Education approved the development of a system strategic plan and in June 1990 the Board approved the Strategic Plan, "Towards 2000 Shaping Our Future". Six critical issues were identified by the Planning Team, and four of them identified teacher professional development as being paramount. The Action Teams identified 54 action plans, 14 of which mandate specific professional development operational plans be developed and initiated.

The huge costs of quality educational programs and innovations for change have been of great concern to the Strathcona County Board of Education. Many macro-implementation policy changes in curriculum, programs and instructional materials are passed down to local boards from Alberta Education over a two or three year period. Examples of this are the large numbers of proposed changes to the elementary and secondary schools Program of Studies. In 1990 a new Social Studies Curriculum was mandated at both elementary and secondary levels. The new elementary school Language Learning

Curriculum and the secondary school Instrumental Music Curriculum were both mandated as of September 1991. In 1992 the mandated curriculum is elementary Mathematics, and elementary and secondary Science.

The cost of training staff for new curricular programs is significant. With the core school subjects of mathematics, social studies, science and English programs being revised in a four year period of time, it became obvious to the Strathcona County Board of Education that a plan of action was necessary. As suggested in the literature the program mandates from the Department of Education coupled with the financial uncertainties faced by Strathcona County " have left schools devastated and frustrated by demands made upon them without the necessary conditions to help make them work" (Lieberman, 1982, p. 250).

The elected officials as well as the Superintendent of Schools wanted to have a planning framework in place so that when new issues or requests were made to initiate change, a relevant process of coping would be available. The two sources of change requests or demands, first Alberta Education and second taxpaying lobby groups or parent groups could be dealt

with in an organized fashion using fair and equal treatment procedures developed in strategic planning. This is also mentioned in the research literature as a means to help overcome the role problem of the school board "whose composition varies over time and whose members are subject to special interest groups, anxious parents and their own political ambition"(Berman, 1978, p. 176).

Local support is absolutely necessary for any change as each of the 54 Action Plans in the Strategic Plan has a student population that will be affected in some fashion by resulting future decisions or actions. The plan has had over 200 people provide input, but less than 100 teachers were involved and there are over 700 teachers in the school system. Fullan and Stiegelbauer state: "Change is a highly personal experience- each and every one of the teachers who will be affected by change must have the opportunity to work through this experience in a way which the rewards at least equal the cost" so communication with the remaining 600 teachers is absolutely essential (1991, p. 127). Many staff development initiatives were proposed by the Strategic Plan to address this issue, however, as Fullan and

Stiegelbauer state "teachers have to have some understanding of the operational meaning of change before they can make a judgement about it" (1991, p. 128). Miles (1980) suggests that the ability to produce and implement technically good decisions means the full use of all teachers affected by a change, and allowing for their deviant ideas to be incorporated into decision strategies right down at the implementation level (p. 8).

The focus of this thesis is the change process as related to the professional development of teaching staff. The Strategic Plan "reflects a significant initiative in the area of human resource management and staff development and training to provide teaching and support staff with the skills necessary to effectively meet the evolving needs of students" (Toward 2000 Shaping Our Future, 1990, p. 36). The initiative reflects a change in the approach to staff development and involves the active participation of the teachers in the County. The importance of having teacher support is suggested by the literature: "The only projects that seemed to produce effective outcomes were those whose paths showed mutual adaptation" (Berman, 1978, p. 178).

Currently professional staff development practices in Strathcona County include one day in-services related to curriculum change and planned by consultants, an institute day planned by teacher volunteers and a two day teachers' convention. Prior to the 1991-92 school year there had been no provision for school initiated staff development.The promotion of school level leadership skill in planning professional development is a high priority item of the superintendent. The desire of the superintendent is to promote active participation at all schools by having staff members work in collaboration with facilitators. Louis (1989) says this "high engagement and low bureaucracy presented the only clear, positive district context" (p. 161). Louis goes on to say that the successful "picture is one of co-management, with coordination and joint planning enhanced through development of consensus between staff members at all levels" (p. 161). A budget for release time was provided for principals and teachers during the 1991-92 school year to attend in-service sessions to develop leadership skills. This process is also suggested by the research as Caldwell and Marshall (1982) state:

> For this type of program to function, the district administration must accept the value of identifying institutional and individual needs, see the preparation of school goals as a priority activity, and view staff development as a means through which the individual and institutional needs can be met. Thus, it is only within this atmosphere of positive change that true staff development can flourish (p. 34)

Purpose of the Study

A pilot version of the staff development project was begun in September 1991. Twenty-one staff members, representing ten schools in the County, volunteered to be "lead teachers" and take training as school-based facilitators to assist their staff in developing a school-based professional development plan. The volunteers participated in the Alberta Teachers' Association program, *Leadership in Professional Development*. The goal of the program is to: "promote and enhance effective, ongoing, school-focused professional development" (The Alberta Teachers' Association, 1988,

p. 1). As a result of participation in the leadership program a school-based staff development committee and a plan for professional development activities for the following year were to be in place in each of the schools participating in the pilot program. These were to be facilitated by the participants in the leadership program.

The study is a description of the early stages of implementation of school-based staff development and the perceptions of teachers involved in the training program as well as the members of their respective staffs. Teacher perceptions regarding school-based professional development planning or activity in the respective schools are reported as these teachers progress through the leadership program. The study also provides an indication of the levels of use of the training program.

Problem

The question addressed in this study focused on the implementation of school-based staff development in Strathcona County. The question was: Did the training of

lead teachers facilitate the formation of a school-based professional development plan in their school?

The study describes the process as lead teachers participated in the leadership program and worked with their respective staffs to initiate a school-based staff development plan in their respective schools. The perceptions of the lead teachers with respect to the use of the skills they acquired in the training program and their roles as facilitators in their schools, as well as the perceptions of teachers in the schools participating in the program are described.

The Significance of the Study

A study of the implementation of a school-based staff development program is significant for a number of reasons. Researchers (Barth,1991; Caldwell and Marshall, 1982; Pansegrau, 1983; Showers, 1983) have found that successful staff development programs are teacher centered and school-based. It is then useful to study the implementation of programs that are similarly directed.

The study is also of value to the administrators in Strathcona County as a means of evaluating the implementation of the program. Fullan and Stiegelbauer state: "teachers have to have some understanding of the operational meaning of change before they can make a judgement about it" (1991, p. 128). The responses of those involved gives direction to the supervisor of staff development as an indication of the direction of the program in terms of modifications and/or continuance.

Chapter II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Staff development is defined as "something the teacher does for himself or herself" as opposed to "something the school does to the teacher" (Doll, 1983, p. 38). Staff development has become a means for professional and personal renewal for teachers. Historically staff development has had three distinct components: system in-service, conferences or professional development days, and post graduate training or classes. In the period from 1940 to the early 1970's staff development or in-service was done to teachers in order to improve their teaching methods or to give them a new or better curriculum to teach. Conferences and professional development days tended to be one-shot attempts to introduce new teaching strategies or curriculum materials. Post graduate training was seen as a means for advancement and did not appeal to the majority of classroom teachers. As stated by Harris(1980):

> This chronicle of in-service education as an evolving set of concepts and methodologies from

> 1940 to 1975 is hardly reassuring. Despite a long history of recognition as an essential part of the ongoing operation of the school program, in-service education seems constantly ensnared or diverted by less fundamental, but seemingly more urgent, development efforts... (p.25).

Until the mid-seventies the professional development of teachers was of little concern as post secondary institutions were involved with the pre-service training of teachers and school boards were coping with rapidly increasing student enrollments. This began to change as enrollments decreased and the problems of teaching students with different learning capabilities became apparent. In 1974 school-based staff development was given as a direction for the future (Beegle and Edefelt, 1977).

New curriculum that had been introduced in various subjects was not being implemented in schools. In an attempt to find out the reasons for this lack of implementation the Rand Corporation undertook a major study of newly innovated curriculum that had been instituted by the federal department of education in the U. S. A. The study took four years to complete and the

findings were to herald a new era of interest in and direction for staff development. The study, which came to be known as the Rand Change Agent Study, examined staff development in "the context of broader changes in schools associated with various types of federally funded projects ... and identified four clusters of broad factors as crucial to the successful implementation and continuation of local change efforts" (McLaughlin and Marsh, 1979, p. 71).

The four main findings were:

1. Teacher commitment is very important as change is unlikely to take place unless teachers are prepared to work hard to make it happen.

2. Administrators must be supportive of the change from the outset of the project and teachers need to be aware of the top level commitment.

3. Collaborative planning involving both teachers and district level staff is necessary for both short and long term success.

4. The greater the change in teaching style required and the greater the effort required by the teachers to make

the change resulted in increased commitment made by a greater number of teachers.

The Rand Study also indicated the importance of continual learning for staff as a means of fostering professional development.

> In summary, the Rand study suggests that effective staff development activities should incorporate five general assumptions about professional learning:
>
> Teachers possess important clinical expertise.
>
> Professional learning is an adaptive and heuristic process.
>
> Professional learning is a long-term, nonlinear process.
>
> Professional learning must be tied to school-site program-building efforts.
>
> Professional learning is critically influenced by organizational factors in the school site and in the district (McLaughlin and Marsh, 1979, p. 90).

The findings of the Rand study confirm the research of change theorists as related to the process of planned change and staff development (Burke, 1987; Fullan, 1991; Harris, 1980 and 1989; Hewton, 1988; Loucks-Horsley,

1989 and Metzdorf, 1989). Staff development at the building level is a change from top down or centralized in-service to bottom up or decentralized staff development and requires major modifications in the way staff development is viewed. In order to ensure the support of all those involved in the change process everyone, from school board members to the teaching staff, must be aware of the reasons for the new direction. The one shot in-service or conference day has not lead to implementation of the desired changes in the classroom as change is a complex and difficult process that takes time to implement (Fullan and Stiegelbauer, 1991). Calvert and Crouse (1987) aptly state:

> Research abounds, telling us that the emphasis on the one shot professional development activity must decline in favour of professional development processes which are spread out over a period of time and in which the major responsibility for planning and implementation is given to the participating bodies (p. 29).

Teachers are adults and research has also shown that adults learn differently. This knowledge is an important part of planning for staff development.

Loucks-Horsley et al (1987) list four conditions necessary for adult growth that must be taken into account in staff development programs: "...opportunities to try out new practices; careful and continuous guided reflection and discussion about the proposed changes; continuity of programs and time for significant change; and personal support as well as challenge during this change process" (p. 14).

The importance of staff facilitators and school-based planning teams are also mentioned in the research. Teachers are a key in any improvement or planned change in the school and having selected teachers trained as trainers or facilitators is a cost effective way to provide on-site and ongoing assistance for staff. Teachers trained as trainers have a greater commitment to the success of the program, are more aware of local needs and other teachers will find it easier to identify with them and thus accept the new learning being offered (Loucks-Horsley et al,1987).

Teachers learn best from other teachers yet isolation in the classroom is the norm for the modern teacher (Cummings, 1985). Teachers need to learn how to work together as a team, to collaborate, that is to

discuss, plan, study, observe and practice in a collegial or sharing atmosphere if they are to participate in the change process. This difficult and time consuming process requires full and active support from the superintendent, central office administration and the principal if it is to be interpreted as an important and worthwhile activity by the teachers at the school level (Calvert and Crouse, 1987; Loucks-Horsley, 1989; Pelton, 1983; Showers, 1984 and Wood, 1989).

"Change is a process not an event..." (Fullan and Stiegelbauer, 1991, p. 49). In order for change to be effective and for significant improvement to occur in school programs or in the process of teaching a number of variables will need to be addressed. These include: frequent review, perhaps redirection of the program, resources, both financial and human, and support from key administrators over a period of three to five years. The "most successful change is simultaneously top-down and bottom-up. The best strategy is to work both ends of the fence" (Loucks-Horsley, 1989, p. 121).

Chapter III

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

Marshall (1989) states: "...when the primary interest is in understanding how the staff development program is being implemented and how participants are perceiving the program, the case study is a promising formative evaluation model" (p. 95).

This case study includes the observation of participants in a facilitator training pilot program. A structured interview with the participants and members of their respective staffs determined their perceptions of the program. The observations took place during facilitator training workshops and structured interviews were scheduled after the various staffs had the opportunity to apply the acquired concepts. The interview was structured using questions proposed by Loucks et al (1987) to elicit responses regarding teacher perceptions (pp. 155-162). This process provides a description of what teachers perceive as the current status of their respective staff development programs.

The content analysis is a descriptive narrative which analyzes subject responses to each structured

interview question. Responses from selected elementary, junior and senior high school teachers and administrators from the schools involved in the pilot program in school-based staff development were studied. Through analysis of the responses to the interview questions, trends, similarities and differences between school staff development programs are described using specific detailed examples. The researcher has examined the responses for differences between the trained facilitators and other staff members. The process has also attempted to identify the characteristic Levels of Use (LoU), as described by Hall and Loucks (1982), exhibited by the various school staffs. The implementation as perceived by each staff as a group is described with specific examples.

Research Design

In this chapter the procedure that was used in collecting the data for the study is discussed. This study is descriptive in nature. Data were collected using participant observation and interviews with administrators and teachers involved as facilitators in

the pilot program and members of their respective staffs.

The study was conducted during the 1991-92 school year and includes researcher observations of participants in the facilitator training pilot program during training workshops. The facilitator training pilot program was observed as a means of determining the content and proposed strategies of implementation of school-based staff development and the participants' involvement and interest in the program. Structured interviews were conducted with the participants and members of their respective staffs to determine their opinions and perceptions of the status of their respective staff development programs after they had the opportunity to apply the acquired concepts.

The interviews were structured using questions proposed by Loucks et al (1987) to elicit responses regarding teacher perceptions of levels of use of the pilot program. The interview questions were pre-tested in practice interviews with a member of central office administration as well as a principal not involved in the pilot program. Their comments were included in the data analysis.

Following the field testing of the interview questions the researcher purposively sampled and interviewed an administrator and a teacher involved in the pilot program as well as two teachers not involved in the pilot program in each of two elementary schools, one junior high school and one high school. The use of these sources provides the triangulation necessary to increase the validity of the conclusions drawn from the data. The researcher shared the results of the data analysis with the superintendent, the associate superintendent of human resources, the director of staff development and the administrators and teachers involved in the pilot program as a means of verifying the accuracy of the data.

Data Collection

Interview data were collected with a tape recorder (with permission) as well as written notes. The interview questions were intended to gather opinions and perceptions of the status of the staff development programs as well as the perceived levels of use of the pilot program. The questions were used as a guide but

when other lines of discussion developed that improved the researcher's understanding or served to clarify the content they were persued.

The interview questions for the teachers and administrators were:

1. What do you know about the "Leadership in Professional Development" program?
2. Does the approach in this program differ from, or is it similar to, the approach to staff development currently in use in your school?
3. In your view, what are the reasons this program is being implemented?
4. What does the program mean to or for you?
5. When are you planning to implement this program in your school?
6. How much time is it taking?
7. What are your concerns regarding this program?
8. Where are you today in your planning with regard to the program?
9. What would cause you to terminate this process?

Data Analysis

The responses to the interview questions were transcribed, read and reviewed allowing the researcher the opportunity to analyze the content. The researcher used a qualitative emphasis in content analysis. "Qualitatively ...[to] examine various ideological mind sets, themes, topics, symbols, and similar phenomena, while grounding such examinations to the data" (Berg, 1989, p. 107). Content analysis is described by Berg (1989) as: "...a particularly beneficial procedure when assessing events of processes in social groups ... It is likewise helpful in many types of exploratory or descriptive studies" (p. 126).

The ideas or observations that the researcher determined to be significant to the study were identified by color coding, the analysis was conducted and the content was categorized using the interview questions as a guide.

Chapter IV

THE RESULTS

In this chapter the content of the *Leadership in Staff Development Program* and the researcher observations of participants in the facilitator training pilot program workshops are briefly described. The perceptions and opinions of the interview respondents regarding the school-based staff development program are presented and discussed. The Levels of Use of the program, the innovation, are also identified and discussed. Quotations are included to illustrate and clarify the discussion. Some of the quotations have been modified to improve clarity but care has been taken to maintain the ideas being conveyed.

Leadership in Staff Development Program - Level One

The *Leadership in Staff Development Program* offered by Strathcona County Staff Development in conjunction with the Alberta Teachers' Association involved teachers and administrators from ten schools in the system who had volunteered to participate in the program. They attended sessions in a central location and were instructed by Noreen O'Haire from the A.T.A. The

sessions were held in October and November, 1991 and January 1992.

The overall goal of the program is, as stated by the A.T.A. (1988), to "promote and enhance effective, ongoing, school-focused professional development". The specific objectives are:

*To prepare school-based personnel for leadership roles in conducting professional development activities at their schools.
*To increase understanding of the essential components of effective professional development.
*To explore a variety of staff development models which can be adapted to individual school needs.
*To examine the process of change and staff development as change.
*To develop the self confidence of participants in using group process skills which encourage staff participation in the decision - making process.
*To establish a collegial support network for school leaders in staff development.
*To provide an opportunity for participants to design an action plan for his/her school, based on

> an assessment of the staff development needs and individual school assessment (The Alberta Teachers' Association, 1988, p. 1).

The objectives for the first session included: the clarification of goals, assumptions and rationale of the program; the clarification of goals, assumptions and expectations of the participants and the reconciliation of these with the program design; a review of the research on effective staff development/professional development; an examination of various models of staff development and an increased awareness about effective practice; an exploration of methods of assessing and developing readiness for staff development within a school staff; introducing and practicing two models of needs assessment and the initiation of a process for networking (Alberta Teachers' Association, 1988, p. 1). At the conclusion of the first session the representatives from each school were asked to go back to their school and begin the process of goal setting and action planning by forming a professional development committee and working with their respective staff in planning and administering a needs assessment for their school.

The objectives for the second session included: relating the principles of adult learning to staff development; the examination and practice of the essentials of planning; practicing a planning model for staff development and the identification of further needs (Alberta Teachers' Association, 1988, p. 19). At the conclusion of the second session the school representatives were given the assignment of determining, with their staff, a model for their school for staff development and to identify further needs of their staff.

The objectives for the third session included: an examination of the process of change; viewing staff development as a change process; further exploration of setting goals and planning programs of staff development; the identification of resources for staff development or professional development; assessment of the present situation and analysis of the needs for next year and the evaluation of the project (Alberta Teachers' Association, 1988, p. 34). The assignment for the school representatives at the conclusion of the final session was to develop a plan for staff development for their school for the coming year.

The sessions were very upbeat and involved a variety of teaching strategies such as small and large group activities, role playing, sharing sessions and discussion. The successes and problems that the participants encountered were discussed at the beginning of each session.

> administrator: I think it's more the attitudinal. Awareness of the value of it, awareness of some of the techniques that can be used although I don't think that a lot of actual techniques have been taught or practiced in the sessions. I think mostly what she's worked on is just the value of it, just getting started. Even getting started I don't know, if you read the articles that were given out it gives you some practical ideas, it gives you a network of people that you know were trying to go through the same thing so I guess it gives you somebody to contact when once you get going.

> teacher: I found the program extremely well organized ... I have found that each of the sessions in turn have become more informative as you go along. The first session I was pretty well lost, it seemed to be theories coming from all

different directions. Now I'd had some of these theories before in courses so I could relate to what she was trying to tell us about professional development and about ways of working with adults but as she went on to the second session it started to come together a little bit better and be more pertinent to what you could actually do with your staff and then by the third one it was even better ... And what I could see happening is I could see in my own mind being able to formulate how to use some of her ideas and how to actually begin to rally some of the staff around to staff based or school-based staff development. So it was an incremental type of a learning situation. I found that the activities that she did with us were very much geared to how they could be used in the school. If you didn't want to use the activities in the school then they helped to bring awareness of the need for staff development a little higher and the level just grows a little bit higher there.

teacher: I certainly have enjoyed the sessions. Noreen O'Haire I find is very easy to listen to. She knows what she's talking about and she's is

interesting to listen to at the same time. I think the things she talks about are good for administrators and teachers to listen to and the type of skills that she's promoting.

teacher: ... from a personal perspective it's giving me a wonderful opportunity to learn techniques for working with adults and if I want to eventually go into some kind of administrative position knowing these concepts and perspectives on different people and working with different people will certainly give me a good chance to practice beforehand. I don't like to go into something unless I am well prepared and this is a very good preparation for anybody who wants to go into any kind of a leadership role.

Discussion

When comparing the interview findings with the stated goals of the program the results indicate that the goals of the program have generally been met. The participants in the program were: aware of the essential components of staff development, cognizant of the

leadership skills they had developed and were using those skills with their staff. The participants also mentioned that they had developed a collegial network. The participants indicated that they found the experience to be positive and rewarding. These findings are similar to the research findings of Barth (1991), Caldwell and Marshall (1982) and Showers (1983) that successful staff development programs are teacher centered and school-based.

Fullan and Stiegelbauer (1991) also state:"Teachers need to participate in skill-training workshops, but they also need to have one-to-one and group opportunities to receive and give help and more simply to *converse* about the meaning of change" (p. 132). The participants in the program experienced all of these opportunities and are therefore able to accept the change more readily.

The importance of staff facilitators and school-based planning teams are also mentioned in the research (Loucks-Horsley et al, 1987; McLaughlin and Marsh, 1979) for they are the ones that initiate the long and short range changes in the program. In each of the participating schools the program provided training for

facilitators and the provision for the formation of staff development committees.

Analysis of Interview Responses

The following section describes selected responses to the interview questions as a means of determining similarities and differences among interview respondents. Particular attention is given to responses from participants involved in the leadership program as compared to responses from participants not involved in the leadership program. The interview questions serve as a frame for the analysis.

Knowledge of the Leadership in Professional Development Program

The teachers and administrators in the pilot program indicated a clear image of the purpose of the leadership program.

> administrator: ... the goal was to get school-based professional development.

administrator: It's a training program for school-based staff development, a series of exercises and knowledge on how to involve and empower staffs to become involved in their own staff development.

teacher: The way I perceive the program ... is essentially helping to train leaders in the school to help to direct the professional development of the staff..and there is a trend to try to implement school-based staff development.

teacher: ...my perception of it is that we're just trying to empower the teachers,... make decisions reach down to the teacher level ... ultimately they feel they know what's best for themselves and for their students...

teacher: When we take a look at professional development we often think of both the in-servicing, anything that has to do with upgrading yourself, upgrading your skills in the teaching field. But we believe that this doesn't necessarily have to be dictated by the system or by someone else and the key here that we've noticed with

mainly within our school is that it's been directed by the staff themselves...

The administrator and teachers who were not involved in the pilot program were generally aware of the purpose of the program although they were much less specific in their descriptions. Two of the respondents stated they knew nothing about the program and one respondent stated that her knowledge was limited.

teacher: That it was offered by the county to I guess initiate in school help programs for teachers into programs that would benefit them for their professional situation.

teacher: There are two people on staff looking after that for our school so the rest of us have more or less been kept in the dark. We do sit down and offer our suggestions on what topics and what things could be done for staff development as a staff...

teacher: We've had it told to us you know, that we're trying to do school-based staff development and that sort of thing so we have had it explained.

teacher: The school p.d. person has been organizing things... throughout the course of the year to try and establish some kind of school-based change in the way that p. d. is done, school-based activities for the school to make things run better ...

Comparison of School-Based Staff Development to the Existing Staff Development Program

All of the respondents were aware of the differences in staff development in their schools. They were positive about the implementation of the program in terms of their increased input into professional development activities during the year. The respondents involved in the pilot program tended to emphasize the change from a top down to bottom up format and the inception of a formal program.

administrator: There wasn't really a model here that I'm aware of. I think the model that was here before I came was you did your two you know system p. d.'s and you went to the institute and that was

it. Whereas what I try to do now is to, yes I really want it to be staff and the staff generates the ideas...

administrator: Prior to what we've been doing this year it was probably a top down kind of staff development where administrators or central office identified areas and then we used that time within the school to do activities or to bring in speakers with the staff. So I think it becomes more a grass roots starting from the bottom, starting where the teachers are and developing a plan for staff development.

teacher: Well the one that was in our school was just very, any staff development that happened was I don't want to say accidental but it was informal left up to people on their own there was no formal program. Now we have a formal program...

teacher: Well definitely the staff feel they have more input and are very much involved and have more say and we've found because of that are probably more responsive and feel as though they have more effect on their p. d. time.

teacher: ... one of the things that I feel is the most important is that the school is involved with the teachers making decisions on what events are going to occur, what type of process they want to go through, what type of activities are important because teachers get results from what ever they're involved in and whatever decisions they make.

The administrator and teachers not involved in the pilot program all mentioned the increase in the staff input.

teacher: ... when I first started teaching it was more of a personal incentive now it's more of a staff-based situation...

teacher: Well before we worked from the top down. Which was a hierarchical structure, a transactional structure. Now we're working from the bottom up we're trying to meet the needs of our staff, me being part of that staff. Rather than having programs forced upon us for the sake of professional development we are now trying to identify authentic needs that happen within the

staff and that's probably the best place where it should be to begin with.

teacher: This way we look at what we think we need to know rather than being told what we need to know which I think is a better way of going about it.

teacher: I see it more as a team approach or a collegial approach where the staff sits down with the administration and we brainstorm a number of ideas of what we see as important in staff development.

Discussion

The findings indicate that the administrators and teachers interviewed were aware of the purpose of the leadership in staff development program and the inherent changes and were positive about the increased teacher input. The participants in the pilot program were more specific in their knowledge of both the purpose of the program and the type of program that was to be offered. This finding supports Fullan and Stiegelbauer's statement: "teachers have to have some understanding of

the operational meaning of change before they can make a judgement about it" (1991. p.128).

There is a general indication of awareness of the change from a top down to bottom up emphasis in staff development among the participants in the leadership program. However the leadership program is a top down innovation and there is a general acceptance by the participants of the top down emphasis for the training of leaders. The aspect of lead teacher training was consistently supported by both trained and untrained respondents. The resulting school level teacher empowerment in the determination of their own staff development programs was viewed positively.

The interview data indicate the participants see the top down or system level training of lead teachers as necessary so that bottom up activity is fostered. This is also supported in the research as Loucks-Horsley (1989) suggest that the best change strategy is to "work both sides of the fence" (p. 121).

Reasons for the Implementation of the Program

The administrators and teachers involved in the pilot program generally referred to meeting the needs of teachers and awareness of research as reasons for the implementation of the program.

> administrator: The change is due to awareness of literature and what is happening elsewhere. The hot knowledge is that one shot sessions are a waste of time and there is a gap between needs and givens.

> administrator: Because I think they really want to find out what the needs are and pursue those needs that people have. And I think that teachers are professionals and they can identify their needs and will pursue those needs.

> administrator: Research shows that decentralization in decision making and especially not telling people what they have to do is the best thing. I think you know if I give you the opportunity to make some choices you're going to make some wise choices.

administrator: I think some initiatives have come from Alberta Ed. plus they've seen research, the leadership in the County has seen research that shows the value of it. I think the main impetus for anything that's happened that's really successful has come from teachers themselves not necessarily central office staff. I guess I have the personal impression that it's getting sort of support or implementation because it's one of the things we should be doing.

teacher: ... probably to meet the needs of individual teachers. Teachers have said for such a long time that they're always told what to do and lots of these sessions, the system designed sessions, don't relate to what their needs are.

teacher: I can't say I really know what initiated it but I assume there must have been some wishes on the part of teachers and I suspect that central office felt there was a need to move in that direction, that there is sort of a shift in the way of thinking that things have to come from the ground up rather than the top down, that those

involved have a vested interest and know what they want to be p.d.'d in.

Respondents mentioned the need to prepare teachers for change to give them the necessary time and training to work together to facilitate changes. Improvement of staff morale in the county was also mentioned with the absentee rate at professional development activities given as an indication of teacher dissatisfaction with the system in-service format. Two of the respondents stated that they perceived the program may have been implemented because it was "the thing to do".

Those not involved in the training program also referred to meeting the needs of teachers to ensure teacher "buy in" as reasons for implementation of school-based staff development.

administrator: Well I think because p.d. doesn't work unless you have buy in and that virtually all efforts to have a centralized system going have ultimately failed or at least they have not been cost effective in the time and energy spent.

teacher: ... accountability of teachers too I think simply makes it necessary for teachers to I guess do some upgrading, ...

teacher: Well because teachers weren't buying into it. It's easy enough to set up workshops in which you hope teachers will take advantage of and will then implement into their classrooms but opposite is such the case. If you do not have teachers cognizant or their will to want to do something to change their methods and their procedures or to change their attitudes and their beliefs because you're imposing a change on them you won't get it.

teacher: In m' opinion I think the reason it's being implemented is whoever has seen the light has finally realized that teachers know what they need to do and that we should have full participation in being able to decide what we do need to know.

teacher: I think that shift is because it becomes more of a staff oriented or school oriented focus. The needs are being met for that particular staff rather than being of a generic variety that was handed down by central office. We can focus in on

what we feel as a staff in areas that we, you know feel that need developing if we're weak in certain areas well we're gonna have staff development in those areas.

Discussion

The findings generally indicate that the administrators and teachers were aware that staff development was in need of a change and that the current programs were not meeting the needs of the teachers in the system. This was given as a reason for lack of teacher "buy in" and attendance at system in-services. There is support for these perceptions in the literature as Doll (1983) defined staff development as something that the teacher did for themselves rather than something that was done to them (p. 38).

School-based staff development was given as the direction for the future as early as 1974 (Beegle and Edelfelt, 1977). Pansegrau (1983) found that teachers do try to maintain or improve their effectiveness in the classroom by "ongoing, in-school contacts with colleagues" and "participating in program development"

(p.vi). Welch et al (1990) found that "the school is the best unit around which to organize staff development programs" (p. 19). These findings appear to be supported in the interview data as the participants in the pilot program indicated the needs of the teachers were better met through the school-based program.

The interview data also indicated the participants were aware of the current research data as several of the respondents referred to the recent research. The respondents also perceived the senior administration to be aware of the literature as well as recent trends in the area of staff development. The respondents generally perceived that there was an attempt to meet the needs of the teachers in the system and viewed this in a positive manner.

The Meaning of the Program to Individual Teachers

Administrators and teachers interviewed all responded that the leadership program was a positive learning experience for them.

> administrator: It's a chance to call on teachers to become their own architects both personally and professionally.

administrator: Well I think it allows me a lot of flexibility. I think it allows for a great deal more collaborative kind of collegial planning. Knowing that I have two people who are working with me makes it easier because I can delegate ... I guess I feel like I'm a participant in staff development ... I was sort of a mediator, I wasn't really a participant in it.

administrator: I think the way it is here it's giving us a chance to become a much more effective school than we were before. The tremendous number of ideas that teachers have had for things that we can do and the enthusiasm that's come out it went far beyond what I expected would ever happen.

teacher: As a teacher within our school it gives me an opportunity to put input or give input into all the policies or any of the programs that we're working on and not feel that our hands are tied.

teacher: First of all that I can have some input or say as to what is going to be offered and make suggestions as to what my needs are. But as one of

the leaders in the program I've found the positive response from the staff very welcoming ...

teacher: It also reaffirmed a lot of things that I felt and I believed but never voiced an opinion about but just kept inside me but now I can speak out more easily when we're together.

An administrator and two of the teachers mentioned that the knowledge that they had gained from the sessions was helping them work with their staffs. One of the administrators stated that the program was of little use to them as they already had the knowledge and was "not really picking up very much".

The teachers not involved in the training program generally indicated an increase in sharing and interaction among staff members.

teacher: It means that the staff has an opportunity to share and interact and do things together.

teacher: Me personally? I think it probably offers the opportunity to be part of a staff in which the staff is starting to move forward instead of everyone going different directions at one time.

Hopefully by identifying staff needs within the school the staff can then work as a unity in creating a professional program that moves forward with the staff as a whole.

teacher: Sometimes there's way more ideas but I think it's really I just like to interact with the other teachers...

teacher: For me it allows each individual to be involved with making the decision. Whether that's going to affect the outcome or not of what areas of staff development are going to occur but at least you've had a say and you've been a part of that decision making process within your staff. It makes you feel part of being involved in the whole program.

teacher: I guess there's two sides to that one, one side is the opportunity for me to gain something from people with more experience ... and then the other side would be so that I could I guess give my expertise in my trade to those who could utilize that. I think that that's very important that you

have teachers not only teaching the students which is their job but also helping out colleagues.

Discussion

The researcher sensed a positive tone to the responses, a sense of renewal and opportunity. Research on adult learning suggests that approaches which try out new practices and discussion about the proposed changes creates conditions that are necessary for adult growth (Loucks-Horsley et al, 1987; Welch et al, 1990). The interview data provide support for this as the teachers involved in the pilot program indicated an increase in sharing and interaction which was gratifying to both the staff leaders and their respective staff members.

Drader (1990) states that "there was a greater degree of collaboration and collegiality with the school-based model" (p. 108). He also states that principals involved in school-based staff development programs often work with their staff to customize programs for their school (1990, p. 108). The interview data indicated that the administrators in the pilot program were working in collaboration with their staff

members to institute school-based staff development programs and found this to be rewarding. The participants in the program also generally indicated that it was a positive learning experience.

The interview data indicated the respondents viewed the process of planning for their own staff development as an opportunity to become involved in activities with their staff as a means of improving and moving ahead as a group rather than as individuals. This was also viewed as a positive opportunity.

Awareness of the Implementation of School-Based Staff Development

All of those interviewed were aware that the program had been implemented in their school. Those in the pilot program indicated an awareness of the process that had been used as well as the plans for continuing the program in the following year.

> administrator: This is the end of year two of a five year plan.

administrator: Well, actually we have been sort of working I think with that model all year like we have been doing a lot of planning, ...

administrator: We started back prior to Christmas with an initial needs survey... we have since refined our priorities and set some goals for the October in-service...

teacher: We already are. It already is being implemented. We did an assessment of what the staff wanted ... and then of course we took the suggestions of what we wanted for p.d. to the general meeting and discussed them ... we looked at those about a month or so ago and decided what had been done, what was in the plans for next year system wide ... and we took those ideas and we built them into a school-based day next year so we already have our plans made for next year.

teacher: We've done a little bit of it this year just at the coordinators level where we're saying go back talk with your people ... and next year will probably be some real tangible things...

The administrator and teachers in the schools indicated an awareness of the existence of school-based staff development in their schools but two teachers were not aware of plans for the following year.

administrator: Well if something like that comes down the pipe, and to my knowledge it hasn't yet, asking about next years' plan for this I would be involved.

teacher: Now to some extent. We did at the last staff meeting identify three topics that we would look at this next year...

teacher: ... we're looking to have it in place by next year where we'll know what we're going to do...

teacher: The program is implemented in our school.

teacher: Whether it's going to happen continually or not, I don't know.

teacher: We've already had some school-based stuff now and I know next year we will be having much more of it.

Discussion

The findings indicate that all respondents are familiar with the implementation of school-based staff development while the administrators and teachers involved in the training program are more aware of the future plans. The participants in the leadership program have developed their subjective meaning of the change while the large groups they represent are not as familiar with or interested in the change (Fullan and Stiegelbauer, 1991, p. 63).

Welch et al (1990) state: "Teachers must be given an opportunity to identify their individual needs...The evidence is overwhelming: get teachers involved in identifying needs, planning and implementing programs, presenting, and coaching" (p. 20). The interview data indicate that the participants in the pilot program had conducted needs surveys to identify the needs of their respective staffs, and were working with their staff to meet those needs through planning and implementing staff development programs in their respective schools.

Perceptions of the Time Involved to Implement School-Based Staff Development

Respondents involved in the pilot program indicated that there was extra time involved to implement the school-based staff development program but that the time spent was worthwhile. Their perceptions of the amount of extra time required to implement the program varied from estimates of four hours to eighteen to twenty hours.

> administrator: I don't regret having done it, but I regret the fact that I wasn't further along in my career because I really could not devote the kind of time that it needed to do it properly.
>
> administrator: One thing is it's sure a big time consumer. It's just another block of time that I don't have. I didn't have to begin with and I have to find time for it. In the long run it's worthwhile time you get things in order.
>
> administrator: The planning before the first meeting took about eight to ten hours and then of course people did things individually above and beyond that. ... there's probably been another seven or eight hours of meetings after the initial

meeting ...you don't realize the amount of time you spend until you start looking back over it. ... The other thing that I should say I was given forty minutes a day from the beginning of the year to the end to work ... helping out where ever I could to get sort of collaboration going...I think it was really good to have that to start it off. In fact I don't even know whether if it would have got going if I hadn't had that time. It was really valuable time.

teacher: it hasn't taken that much time yet ... but we haven't taken any really great lengthy amount of time with the staff we've wanted to come across slowly and in small doses.

teacher: I don't know if we could put an hourly time on it. If we were to take an hourly rate or an actual count of hours of time we would have to talk to each person because ...I can see them easily spending ... six maybe to ten hours that some of these teachers have spent of their own time in additional meetings, in collecting information...

teacher: I'm not sure how much time our administrator is putting into it. ... I know at the coordinators level I guess depending on what on how big a piece of pie you want to chew ... So I would think four or five people sitting together to establish the five or six tasks would take an hour a task because you have to decide who's involved, how you want to approach it, how much money you think is necessary...

teacher: Outside the workshop hours I couldn't even give you a guess maybe four or five hours because I don't know how to add up all the times we meet in the hall and all those bits and pieces.

The teachers not involved in the pilot program indicated a superficial awareness of the extra time involved to implement the program as it did not involve them directly. One of the teachers was not aware of any extra time involved in implementing the program and another of the teachers mentioned that they were expecting the program to take more time in the future.

teacher: ... I would say we spend a good two to four hours a month ... as a complete staff and then

there's a time situation there that involves the people who are going to be the leaders for that particular session and I'm sure they spend many more hours than that to prepare for it that particular session.

teacher: I don't know. ... I would imagine it wouldn't take that long because we've done say 15 minutes at the last staff meeting and then it would take them another 15 or 20 minutes or so to go from the lists they got back.

teacher: For me none. For the school I wouldn't say that much time would be involved... Possibly a little more work for (the staff representatives) since they're the ones coordinating the staff development in the school...

teacher: I'm on the outside of it so it's not taking much time for me to set it up. ... but I'm sure to the coordinators it's a lot of time.

Discussion

The analysis of the data generally indicated that the amount of time required to implement school-based staff development varied among respondents. Those not involved in the leadership program were much less aware of the time the implementation required as they were not directly involved. The interview data generally indicated that the larger schools had contributed more time to the implementation of their programs. This could be attributed to the difficulty in communicating with a larger staff or to the emphasis on departments rather than the staff as a whole. As stated in the research: "Professional learning is critically influenced by organizational factors in the school site..." (McLaughlin and Marsh, 1979, p. 90).

The data indicated the perception that the time required to implement the program was worthwhile. This perception is similar to the findings in the literature (Doll, 1983; McLaughlin and Marsh, 1979) that staff development has become a means for personal and professional renewal for teachers.

Concerns Regarding the Program

Respondents indicated a general concern regarding time and money to support the program.

administrator: Time, money. I guess I would like to have sessions for example that people might be interested in where do I get the money from to get speakers?

administrator: The matter of costing. It's another cost that has been kind of put into the schools without really much thought that this is going to be extra money.

teacher: Well concerns would definitely be money and time. I feel really comfortable on site where I am about money and time being allotted only because I've seen for next year a number of initiatives that have been approved and will take place.

teacher: There certainly has to be money allocated to the schools ... there's no point having the choice if there's no money coming in to exercise the choice.

teacher: In today's fast paced world we're really tight for time that's probably one of the most valuable commodities that we have and our time in any direction is always being torn, ...

The interview data also revealed other concerns: the amount of change, the need for trust between the staff and the administration, the lack of "buy in" by some staff members and the need for staff members to maintain their level of energy and enthusiasm.

administrator: The "numberness" and the variety of changes. That is there are so many areas and so much change. ...The bump of teachers are the hardest age to satisfy and change attitudes so they are tough to work with. W.I.I.F.M., what's in it for me, is predominant and it is tough work to get past this as they distrust central office and therefore staff development. The teachers in subject areas look at it, it's my way , by subject.

administrator: I guess I've come to learn that just because the staff generated it doesn't mean that there's a total buy in by all staff. And there are always going to be some people who are going to

have different opinions whether or not the majority of the staff agree. And to those few people I think you say okay you find some thing that is of interest to you that will help you with your professional growth. And as an administrator I think what I have to do is say okay for the most part this is what we're going to do and these other people can pursue their own interests because you see I can't mandate that somebody learn something and I've learned that.

teacher: I guess my main concern is that like anybody I know there isn't going to be an ideal state in any school where you have all the teachers buying in but it sure would make a stronger school if teachers could buy into the school-based staff development. The ones who genuinely bother me are the teachers who decide they're not going to go to school-based no matter what. If there's something else out there they're going to go somewhere else. I don't know, these are the blockers I guess, the ones that you're always gonna have on a staff.

The concerns of those not involved in the pilot program were more diverse as only two teachers mentioned time as a concern.

> administrator: You're fighting against the long traditions of teaching and they've always been very private and so on as opposed to say medicine where doctors look at each other in the O.R. and that sort of thing ... most teachers have very rarely had any other professional watch them work and if you subtract the recent years of teacher evaluation or formal teacher evaluation there was almost none for decades. Nobody ever saw them work and so you're having to break down a lot of barriers that have formed over a very long period of time... Teachers are comfort zone oriented so change is tough.

> teacher: I have concerns because I see our system as an aging population we're not getting a lot of new blood in and there are people who are constantly liking change and welcoming change and there are several others who resist and want to maintain the status quo ... others see it as an

imposition on their personal lives rather than taking it on as a professional responsibility.

teacher: ... my only concern would be that you would isolate yourself in your school, that we would become not aware of what was going on if we did all of these things as a school always together.

teacher: ...teachers are listened to and we can make things happen in the direction that we see fit and there's substance to what happens at the end.

Discussion

The interview data indicated a variety of concerns from the respondents but there appeared to be a general concern among the participants in the leadership program regarding the provision of time and money for the program to continue. It is normal for people to have informational and personal concerns during the initiation phase of an innovation. "Teachers need to know what the change is and how it works; ... what workshops, release time and other support they will get;

and what priority it has with the principal, central office staff members, ... Developing a clear image of what will be implemented and what it will mean to the individual is an important task..." (Loucks-Horsley, 1989, p. 116). This statement also explains the kinds of concerns expressed by the teachers not involved in the leadership program as they had not yet developed a clear image of the school-based staff development program.

The analysis of the data indicated that the participants in the leadership program as a group felt strongly that release time and money for professional development activities must be provided for successful school-based programs. The respondents not involved in the leadership program generated a variety of recommendations as individuals with no consensus regarding time or money. It could be that they found the school-based group sessions they experienced this year to be positive even if the activities involved some of their own time.

Planning With Regard to the Program

The administrators and teachers in the pilot program generally indicated that currently their plans were well underway for the next year.

> administrator: We are one year ahead in the specific area of responsibility of what we're doing and planning for. The supervisor is a master political strategist as he has used the other power groups in the organization to influence the principal's group and thus instructional services.
>
> administrator: We have it all set. ... what we're doing next year in terms of staff development.
>
> administrator: We have set or made plans for the October in-service. We have identified some areas that will be looked at in an ongoing way. I guess in that sense we have some goals for next year.
>
> administrator: We took a couple steps back at our last meeting and said ...we've worked on sort of immediate needs that we saw the school had and that is one of the reasons it was successful. Teachers said this school really needs this and let's do

something to change it. What we've done now is taken a step back and said what we need is to do is sit down as a school and say what is our school and what are our educational philosophies here let's brainstorm and let's get some kind of statement of what we stand for. So that's going to be the focus of our next staff development program or staff development meeting.

teacher: Well we have determined all of our in-servicing needs for next year, we've organized our sessions, contacted the speakers and as far as the fall p. d. we're already set to go.

teacher: ... the admin has received all these tasks and they are a part of budget so they are at the logistics point and waiting for next fall to come around to determine what day are you going to go, where and what will the results be.

Generally the teachers not involved in the pilot program were only vaguely aware of the plans for the future of school-based activities and three of the teachers stated that they were not aware of any plans for the future.

teacher: I think the goals for our school reflect probably one to two items that the staff has seen as a need...

teacher: We've done this for next year, we've set up already our staff development day for our staff and those plans have already been scheduled ... for the day we have available to us I believe.

teacher: ... the future, there's been discussions that we might have things going but not a lot of definite this is what's happening in the future so ... pretty up in the air right now.

Discussion

The differences that arose when comparing interview data of the participants in the leadership program with that of their staff members indicated that the two groups differed regarding the future plans of school-based staff development. The participants in the leadership program were aware of the goals and the direction of the program in their schools for next year while the members of their respective staffs were only

vaguely aware of plans for the following year. This is also a normal part of the change process. "Change takes time and attention. It is simultaneously a highly personal experience and one that is tangled in the structures, norms and idiosyncrasies of the organizations, the schools, and districts, in which teaching and learning occur" (Loucks-Horsley, 1989, p. 114).

Ultimately the aim of school-based staff development is to have teachers coaching teachers as a means of improving technical skills in the classroom. The respondents were concerned about how the program would affect them and had not yet progressed to concern about the impact the program would have in terms of benefit to their students.

Reasons to Terminate the Program

Interview respondents generally indicated a reluctance to terminate the program. The participants in the pilot program frequently cited lack or withdrawal of central office support as a reason for termination of the program. Several of the respondents also cited

teacher dissatisfaction as a reason to terminate the program.

administrator: I would not (terminate) as I would resign my position if stuff was laid on without school choice.

administrator: I guess if we found there was no support coming from Central Office whether it be in terms of funding or in terms of recognition that staff development is important and consequently teachers do require time to be in-serviced. If it reverted back to too much laid on kind of programs top down I think those would be reasons to terminate.

administrator: There's a natural lead to the whole thing and I can't see any reason to terminate... the superintendent saying we're not doing it this way I guess.

teacher: I think if I found that through our staff meeting discussions about ideas for school-based staff development there were so many staff members who just were not interested in any of the school-based ideas, mind you the school-based ideas came

from them, but if they were still quite fragmented then I would probably say that would be a deterrent. And in order to preserve any kind of staff development I would probably not push it to the degree that it killed all desire for staff development.

teacher: ... there's probably two things that would terminate it or that I feel would terminate it. One is a decrease in student results... Secondly teacher dissatisfaction...

teacher: Personally , I won't terminate the process. I found I was doing a lot of this already but just keeping it to myself. ... It's so much more effective when more people are working on the same problem so I can't see me ever stopping. If one person carries the load for a department it becomes difficult to continue. I would never terminate but I would reduce my enjoyment of it and my willingness to participate in the department. I hope it never reaches that point.

teacher: Well I don't see it as any major movement and I don't think it's going to cause any great

waves so I don't think there should be any great opposition as long as it's not made to look like the teachers are initiating it and in essence there really is too much control from central office. Now I don't know how that could happen but if it's going to be teacher choice it has to be teacher choice.

Respondents not involved in the pilot program indicated a variety of reasons for termination including increased central office control or lack of support from staff and/or administration. Three of the respondents said they could not think of any reasons for termination of the program.

administrator: I would abort it if there was no staff enthusiasm because obviously the individuals who are involved are are not going to continue putting much effort into it if their efforts don't amount to anything.

teacher: The only other thing I see with staff development that might create a termination is overwork on the part of the members, in which 20% of the people then move 80% of the people forward.

So that's overwork or tiredness on the part of those 20% might bring an abrupt halt but hopefully there would be somebody to come in and fill the gap.

teacher: I guess the only thing that would terminate is if these days were taken away from us by the system. If as a system they feel this not the way and means of doing staff development.

teacher: I don't think I ever would terminate it. I think even if the general populace thought that it wasn't a good idea I still think it's something that should continue to be pushed to work towards.

Discussion

The interview data generally indicated administrator and teacher support for a school-based staff development program. The data showed consensus for termination of the program if there was a withdrawal or lack of central office support in terms of release time and funding. Lack of teacher interest was also indicated as a reason for termination of the program. The

respondents felt there was little reason to continue if the teachers in the schools were not involved and willing to contribute to the program.

The data also indicated that the administrators and teachers involved in the pilot schools were committed to the change from system to school-based staff development. This commitment to change is one of the factors that the Rand Study identified as crucial to the success of local change efforts (McLaughlin and Marsh, 1979). The respondents generally indicated that they could not think of any reason that either the staff or the senior administration would not be in favour of the program continuing as they perceived the change as a positive and important step in motivating the members of the teaching staff and improving teacher morale in Strathcona County.

Other Results

During the course of data analysis a number of concepts emerged which were consistent with the literature on planned change in staff development. The

responses from all administrators and teachers were remarkably similar.

The interview responses indicated the importance of teacher centered and school-based staff development programs.

> administrator:I mean I'm a true believer that professional growth must be intrinsically motivated by the needs that teachers have identified. I think that a model that says you will do this and you will spend your professional growth doing this, this and this simply doesn't work. People will be there, they will listen, they will spend time because it is an order, it is part of their job but whether they walk away with this feeling that they have really learned some thing that they're going to apply to children I don't know.
>
> administrator: But if it (staff development) comes from the staff and staff take charge of it then it's going to be successful.
>
> teacher: You know something I've also discovered since we've worked on this is that there's more of the staff going to special meetings. Like on

Wednesday night on program continuity we had a large contingency show up. Twelve of our staff showed up to see that and that's approximately, what is that, approximately 60% of our staff, that's pretty good.

teacher: And if people, the staff, can see the need for and identify with the need from the inside out then the change takes place. If the change is imposed it never becomes permanent it lurches forward for awhile and then it falls back into place.

The interview data indicated that the teachers perceived administrative support as an important concept in the success of their school-based programs.

administrator: I think one of the biggest things, the biggest thing that made our staff development a success so far would be the commitment by the administration to implement what the staff came up with.

teacher: Our administration has gone out of their way to be supportive of the program and to get involved and do a lot of the work and to take time

during staff meetings to ask how it's going. And it's been and to me that's one vital key to the whole thing.

teacher: ... it does take strong leadership and you do have to have strong administration behind you to do this you have to have administrative support. If the administrator is behind it then it makes it much easier to plan ideas and bring it before the staff and talk to the staff about it and we have that here so that's excellent...

teacher: ... I think that's where the strength of the administrative team really shows itself in that they are diverse enough to sort of flow with the wants or needs of their respective staff...

teacher: ... it was excellent that we had the support of administration, that really made it and ... their presence there was great because I thought now the communication is not just amongst us but it's with them as well which is really important.

teacher: Administrative cooperation has to be there to make it work.

One of the teachers did however have some initial concerns in terms of the administrators participating in the workshops:

> teacher: I guess I had concerns in terms of how much can be teacher led if the administrators are still leading it by attending the sessions. I think some of that has faded through the year and it was more initially.

The interview responses of the respondents generally indicated a lack of support for the program by the instructional services department.

> administrator: Instructional services has many roles and descriptions so there is a lack of a common goal.They need a procedure and order.

> administrator: ...there seems to be a conflict between staff development and instructional services. There seems to be some tugging right now and they're not sure, and I'm saying staff development or instructional services, I don't think have their roles defined as of yet in terms of staff development ... But I think there are some growing pains going on and I think there is some...

well I don't know if it's a power play or if it is just a confusion as to roles.

administrator: And I think ... that Central Office has to realize that the supervisors, I hear this term helping teachers, but they are to help administration help teachers and so the whole emphasis has to be working as a whole, a team effort. Not I'm going to go out there and get some, plant some seeds and get this program underway because we have to know what's going on.

administrator: I may be wrong but it seems to me there is, the personal involvement by some central office staff and so on are that the real commitment to it has to grow from what it is now if it's going to continue in the County.

teacher: ... if we are going to maintain those people in the system...Job descriptions would have to change to more of a liaison rather than what they're right now. I think assisting schools and having a person that can come out possibly and assist schools in doing and planning for their own needs would be by far more beneficial.

Several teacher respondents perceived a continuing need for system expertize in staff development.

teacher: ... maybe their needs are not necessarily being met within what the school has identified as the needs at the time so I think the mixture of some system and some school staff development is a good mix.

teacher: ...it's nice that the system,that instructional services are going to cover you know the larger issues.

The interview responses indicated the respondents were aware of the need to alter their approach. There was also a perceived increase in sharing among their staff members as a result of the staff initiatives they were undertaking.

administrator: And getting them all working together rather than just they're working still in isolation as departments and I'm trying to get them working more together as teams.

administrator: Some of it (sharing) comes by the meetings they've had and that carries on into the staff room or into the subject areas and so on.

teacher: At least by doing it on the staff, on the school-based then we can talk about what has gone on on our professional development days and it grows, the ideas grow. The areas that we've been working on, it's not totally bought into, but it's growing and you can see a little more positive aspect all the time and I feel that's because we did it almost totally as a staff and so we have some a common basis to share and to talk about.

teacher: ... what we've tried to relate to the teachers is that a lot of them have skills that they can share with us and people are coming forward and are more interested in doing this on a small group scale. But I think we have to do a lot more of that especially when people go to workshops and conferences and gain information on new things there has to be more sharing.

teacher: I think now that we have something called leadership development in professional development

it just allows sharing to take place because we've given it a title so we're saying sharing is a good thing to do. You're allowed to share ideas, lesson plans with other teachers and I think that's hard to do for teachers...

administrator: The best p.d. that I have seen so far is teachers watching other teachers work. That's the very best, it is. Those are the ones that actually can cause a genuine change in mind set and attitude because I have seen teachers say if that guy can achieve this kind of relationship with his class why can't I? Because the teacher can see the product, can see what is possible and that is a big difference from something that is open ended that says well if you do this, do this, do this. Here is a matter of seeing a product and then the teacher sort of working backwards from seeing the product.

teacher: I guess you need to have teachers deciding the direction, you should have teachers teaching their colleagues, and then have a follow up so the information is not just given then lost.

Another of the results of the data analysis was the perception that neither teacher training programs nor the teachers' professional organization do enough to encourage teacher learning and continued professional growth as a life long pursuit. These respondents were not involved in the pilot program.

> administrator: ... what our professional organization has encouraged is somehow an idea that when a teacher comes out of university and joins the A.T.A. that you are in full bloom and that you remain in bloom for the next thirty or thirty-five years. And that you get better for the first eleven so that you can get your increments and after that you remain just in nice full flower. And so they have found it difficult to plunge into a lot of this stuff without admitting that we're imperfect. Now they have had the Project Teach and Pride and they do have a professional development thing that brings in, that puts together conventions and that sort of thing, but I just don't think that we've ever admitted as an organization that we have a lot to learn, each and every person. On this staff there's certainly no ready admission by too many

teachers that they don't know all they need to know to do their job and do it well. And there's a kind of interesting double think there with teachers because on one hand publicly they claim to know it all or at least they have their style and it's worked for them and that's it but I think deep down inside there's a real gap of confidence there.

teacher: I think our biggest problem lies with the fact that the universities have got to institute into the minds of our young people ... at the under graduate level the understanding that the B. Ed. is not a stopping off place but merely the threshold to their profession. And I really don't think that comes through loud and clear because I see my generation thinking it was the epitome and we didn't have to learn anything else. As long as we got that B. Ed. and our tenure, we were secure. And that security to me has created a lagging situation in several of the members in our profession who just wish to continue from day to day.

Another perception that emerged from the interview data was one that the elementary school personnel were better able to adapt to the school-based program.

administrator: I think the elementary schools are way ahead of us in this regard and they have had some issues that have come up that have been school wide in nature ... And I think the elementary schools have been wrestling with problems and with thrusts that are in fact kind of universal to the whole school. And these kinds of things have not surfaced at the high schools quite yet but we are getting close to, I think, having a situation where our teachers are going to have to learn to teach differently from what they now are ... and at that time I can see that school p.d. would become much more essential than it is now.

administrator: Well you know I don't find, and I think many elementary people do not find, this process foreign. I think for years elementary people have been doing a lot of this kind of stuff. It may not have had a name, it may not have been really organized but we have been making a lot of decisions in terms of in-servicing and staff development. And I think partially because elementary people are required to be versatile in so many areas ... staff development is important.

> It's pretty difficult to stay on top of all the curricular changes for all the different areas. So I guess I find this process very easy and I think elementary teachers especially will be very comfortable with this kind of a process ... they are generalists and always comfortable with school-based ... but the bottom line is we were doing it so people feel comfortable with it. And I think people are happy to come back to it. I don't think our people see this as a change it's just a revert back to what was probably going reasonably well at one time.

The analysis of the data also indicated the participants had developed an increased insight as to the scope and challenge of the change process. These respondents were participants in the leadership program.

> administrator: - It's the bouncing ball concept, always playing catch up. New organizational change shows a move to internal values and climate. There is a combination of inputs but this is seldom planned and that's the norm. Frequent change means an attitudinal change but for some they get into a

rut ... Often people need to be forced to look at new ways of thinking and looking ...

teacher: And that scares me as well as shocks me, the variety of people and ideas to get this to work at the county level really seems staggering. I'm really scared right now and hesitant about how it's going to take place at the county level.

The interview data indicated a general awareness of a negative view of some staff members with relation to staff development.

administrator: The people that aren't excited are in my judgement the people who aren't excited about the profession. And whether you stood up and spit nickels or did a dance on, the staff development is not a priority to them.

administrator: Now you always get some who just still worry about themselves ... I would say you're always talking about 20%, where he's going well we've tried this before and it doesn't work kind of thing. Yeah again if you dwell on those and gear your program for those you're going to a self

fulfilling prophesy of failure. You just have to go ahead and do the job and they tap in.

administrator: Staff get pretty jaded after a while about the whole p. d. thing. You know we have been really heavily in-serviced or at least have had lots of opportunities for in-service for about the last seven or eight years I guess and I think it's hard to get people excited about little local things when they've had the opportunity to attend things in New Orleans or Halifax or San Francisco and to be at gatherings that had eminent, exciting, you know, world renowned people speaking to them. And at the school level you're bringing in somebody from central office perhaps or even one of your own people to put on something and they might be fantastic but you know I think it's you could have some difficulty getting people excited about that and sustaining it year after year.

teacher: It started out really rough in the fall, a lot of grumbling and the grumbling is petering out and now I find that 80% of the staff will participate in any of our school-based activities when they are directed toward our school goals. The twenty odd percent who aren't are really in a

minority, very much so, and they're doing it because of personal reasons.

teacher: It's a push constantly by teachers such as myself or other teachers in the system who are interested in moving the profession forward. You always seem like you're overcoming an invisible resistance of attitudes and beliefs. But I'm not sure how you overcome some of that, I guess some you don't. It's the old 80/20 you worry about the 80 and isolate and work around the 20 and perhaps that will always be the case.

Discussion

Researchers (Barth, 1991; Caldwell and Marshall, 1982; Pansegrau, 1983 and Showers, 1983) have found that successful staff development programs are teacher centered and school-based.The interview data generally supported this statement as those involved in the leadership program perceived school-based staff development would be successful as the teachers were being given the opportunity to identify their own needs and to plan to meet those needs.

In order to implement change successfully administrators must support the change from the outset of the project and teachers need to be aware of this commitment. This concept was identified in the Rand Change Agent Study as a crucial factor in the successful implementation of local change efforts (McLaughlin and Marsh, 1979, p. 71). The interview data indicated that the respondents perceived administrative support as a key to the success of the program as they attributed much of the progress they had made in the first year of the program to the support and involvement of their administration. The one teacher who initially had reservations regarding administrative participation in the program had become more comfortable with the concept following the leadership sessions.

The Rand Change Agent Study identified collaborative planning involving both teachers and district level staff as necessary for both short and long term success of local change efforts (McLaughlin and Marsh, 1979, p.71). The administrators and teachers interviewed perceived a lack of support from some of the instructional services staff in terms of personal involvement and support for school-based activities. The

respondents indicated there was a need for a change in role descriptions for instructional services staff to facilitate the change in activities as a result of the implementation of school-based staff development. As cited in the literature a major obstacle to change is the reluctance of administrators at all levels to give up "traditional prerogatives" (Fullan and Stiegelbauer, 1991, p. 201).

The data did however indicate a positive attitude toward the system in-services offered by instructional services as a result of identified teacher needs. The respondents perceived the mix of school-based and system staff development activities as positive and were appreciative of the availability of the expertise of instructional services.

The Rand Study also indicated that effective staff development activities should incorporate five general assumptions about professional learning. The interview data indicated that each of the assumptions were incorporated in the professional development activities in the pilot schools. There was a recognition that teachers possessed "important clinical expertise" (McLaughlin and Marsh, 1979, p. 90) as the respondents

indicated that there was an increase in sharing as a result of the staff initiatives that were being undertaken and staff members were volunteering their expertise to assist others on their respective staffs. As work-site peer coaching is the vital end product of school-based staff development the increase in staff interaction regarding teaching expertise is a positive direction in the early stages of this change.

The assumption that professional learning is an "adaptive and heuristic process" (McLaughlin and Marsh, 1979, p. 90) emerged as a theme from the interview data as there was a perception that the most effective professional development activities involved teachers deciding the direction of professional development and observing and teaching their colleagues.

The perception of administrators and teachers indicated the awareness of the need for teachers to be life long learners coupled with the perception that the universities and the professional teachers' organization had done and were doing little to encourage teachers to extend their learning once they had completed their graduate degree and received their permanent certification. As Fullan and Stiegelbauer (1991) state:

"Teacher education, or teacher as learner, from day one, must be thought of as a career-long proposition" (p. 289) and the Rand Study indicated that "Professional learning is a long-term, nonlinear process" (McLaughlin and Marsh, 1979, p. 90). Teacher education has been receiving attention in the research (Fullan and Stiegelbauer, 1991, p.291) and the Alberta Teachers' Association has embarked on improving the concept of teacher as learner through programs such as the *Leadership in Professional Development Program*. The positive perceptions of the participants regarding the leadership program indicate the value of continued professional learning.

Another of the assumptions of the Rand Study regarding professional learning was that professional learning "must be tied to school-site program-building efforts" (McLaughlin and Marsh, 1979, p. 90). One of the objectives of the *Leadership in Professional Development Program* was knowledge of the change process and how the change process relates to staff development in each school as well as the planning of a staff development program that was unique to each school. The emergence of the perceived awareness of the scope and challenge of

the change process required indicates the extent of the professional learning of the respondents and the insight that they have developed as a result of the leadership training.

The interview data also indicated the perception that elementary school personnel are better able to adapt to the school-based program. This perception tends to support the assumption from the Rand Study that "Professional learning is critically influenced by organizational factors in the school site and in the district" (McLaughlin and Marsh, 1979, p. 90). Elementary school teachers are required to be more generalist in terms of the school curriculum than junior and senior high school teachers also elementary schools are on the average smaller than high schools so there is greater potential for communication among staff members.

The interview data generally indicated that the administrators and teachers perceived a reluctance on the part of some staff members to become involved in the school-based program. The negative attitude to change is also noted in the literature (Fullan and Stiegelbauer, 1991; Loucks-Horsley et al, 1987; Williams, 1979) and as Fullan and Stiegelbauer state: "The only way out of this

dilemma is for individuals to take responsibility for empowering themselves and others through becoming experts in the change process" (1991, p.353).The leadership program provides a means for participants to become leaders in the change process and there was a general perception among the participants that the majority of the staff were supportive of the program. The participants in the leadership program expressed an awareness of the process of change as they did not expect all staff members to support the program in the early stages.

Determination of the Levels of Use of the Program

The Levels of Use (LoU) were determined using the Levels of Use of the Innovation by Loucks-Horsley et al (1987) as a basis (pp. 128-163). Six Levels of Use are identified.

1. Level 0 (Non-use) is a state in which the individual has little or no knowledge of the innovation, no involvement with it, and is doing nothing toward becoming involved.

2. Level I (Orientation) is a state in which the individual has acquired or is acquiring information about the innovation and/or has explored its value orientation and what it will require.

3. Level II (Preparation) is a state in which the user is preparing for first use of the innovation.

4. Level III (Mechanical use) is a state in which the user focuses most effort on the short-term, day-to-day use of the innovation with little time for reflection. Changes in use are made more to meet user needs than needs of students and others. The user is primarily engaged in an attempt to master tasks required to use the innovation. These attempts often result in disjointed and superficial use.

4 A. Level IVA (Routine) use of the innovation is stabilized. Few if any changes are being made in ongoing use. Little preparation or thought is being given to improve innovation use or its consequences.

4 B. Level IVB (Refinement) is a state in which the user varies the use of the innovation to increase the impact on clients (students or others) within their immediate sphere of influence. Variations in use are based on

knowledge of both short and long-term consequences for clients.

5. Level V (Integration) is a state in which the user is combining own efforts to use the innovation with related activities of colleagues to achieve a collective impact on clients within their common sphere of influence.

6. Level VI (Renewal) is a state in which the user reevaluates the quality of use of the innovation, seeks major modifications of, or alternatives to, present innovation to achieve increased impact on clients, examines new developments in the field, and explores new goals for self and the organization (Calvert and Crouse, 1987).

The Levels of Use of the program were identified by analyzing the combined interview data of the members of each of the school staffs. The Levels of Use were determined for the early stages of the implementation of the innovation, the formation of a staff development committee and an action plan for staff development for the following year in each of the schools involved in the leadership program. The researcher used the

interview responses to assist in the identification of LoU.

School A

School A is an elementary school.

administrator: ... we have set or made plans for the October in-service. We have identified some areas that will be looked at in an ongoing way. I guess in that sense we have some goals for next year. We are going to be concentrating on a couple of areas and we have the commitment I think from the staff so I think we're in good shape.

teacher: Well we have determined all of our in-servicing needs for next year, we've organized our sessions, contacted the speakers and as far as the fall p. d. we're already set to go. We've left it open to the teachers however that if they feel the need to go to something else that another school may be planning they're open to do that. And so far we feel that we've got our needs itemized for the

whole year but they can change as the time goes on. We're further ahead than we thought we'd be.

teacher: For next year I think we're pretty well geared up. I think at our meeting we'll just have to go over like whether who we're going to have for speakers or if we're going to have speakers or if we're gonna have people in but I think we've narrowed it down to two or three things that we want to do and then I think it's just a question of how we're going to handle it from there. I think we're pretty well organized, we're pretty efficient over here.

teacher: So for that day in Oct. we have already as a staff planned for our p.d. day. So we've been quite active... with sitting down with (the representatives) and the rest of the staff and coming up with a number of ideas, a number of these topics. We've prioritized these topics as a staff and decided that these were the two areas that were most needed and we have one in the morning and one in the afternoon. So our day is set.

Discussion

The administrator and the teacher involved in the training program, as well as their staff members, appeared to be at LoU IVA (Routine) as they have started using the innovation, school-based staff development, and it is stabilized. The respondents generally indicated a knowledge of the program and were aware of the plans for the following year. The interview data indicated that the staff had actively participated in identifying their needs regarding staff development and in selecting the sessions for the upcoming year.

The respondents did not indicate any planning for improvements in their program at this time however the data does indicate that the staff members are aware of the innovation and have surpassed the leaders expectations in terms of acceptance of the program. The leaders and their staff members indicated they were confident that the sessions were in place for the next year.

School B

School B is also an elementary school.

administrator: Now what we're doing next year in terms of staff development is (three schools) are doing joint in-service sessions with the total staff on the E.L.A. and the language learning program and that has not only been identified as a need by the system, a mandate by the system, but what I'm excited about is that groups of teachers are getting together, they have identified the kinds of things that are important for them to know ... so they have identified the questions and now the model is in place. And this is the model that we are going with. And this is the model after the (another school) experience. You can't take the (other school) model and put it on this because the needs are different so I'm really am excited about that.... first of all what we did was we generated a whole list and everybody could add all kinds of stuff in there that they would like for staff development next year. Then with that list (the representative) and I got together and we said okay now which ones appeared to be ones that came over

and over again. ... Now, at the staff meeting it was decided or someone had suggested cooperative learning so okay that we were open to that. So now we have three sessions on the go, ... but we can't offer all three. So now what we did was at the staff meeting we took a vote. ... And with these things what we did was we said what the purpose of it would be, who would deliver it, what the model would be for delivery all of those things. The staff were in agreement and you know there were absolutely no hassles about it.

teacher: ... so we already have our plans made for next year. And then we are going to be doing our goals and objectives before school ends this year for next year and having some idea of what's out there for p. d. will also make, it'll help to tie it all together the school goals and objectives and if there is something in our goals and objectives that we haven't covered then we can look at that down the road too. It, the whole program has allowed for a lot better long range planning, it's really given it a base to work on.

teacher: Well I think we're at a stage that we're comfortable at in terms of we met a couple of months ago and made our plans for next year ... We had a list we made up some months ago. Staff made suggestions and from that we deleted those we felt would be better dealt with at the county level, and so we had three items and the teachers chose two from that. And the teachers felt comfortable with the two we selected. I feel comfortable with that we know what we are doing next year and they certainly coincide with the movement in education in terms of cooperative learning.

teacher: As part of the staff needs for next year and because I've been a coordinator for several years I hope to work in some mini workshops, with the staff, of fifteen, twenty minutes at the staff meetings ... Next year I will also be peer coaching on our staff and this would be considered staff development too in which we are working the technology with the curriculum. I have been doing that for several years but now the teacher is going to take over the class level with the computer work.

Discussion

The administrator and teachers in school B appear to be at Level V (Integration) as they are combining their use of the program with colleagues in related activities. The data indicates that activities are taking the form of combining sessions with other schools as a means of sharing expertise with other teachers and initiating the concept of peer coaching in their own school. The respondents also indicated that they were involved in long range planning in terms of school goals and objectives.

The staff members were aware of the innovation and actively involved through the process of needs identification and selection of sessions for the following year. The respondents generally indicated they were "comfortable" with the direction of the school was taking in relation to school-based staff development.

School C

School C is a junior high school.

administrator: I've got my staff team we have met throughout the year and we've already, the staff team, come up with the goals for that and we compiled the compilation of our goals from last year building them up on to what we're going to be doing for this year. So we've our two I got my rep., myself as well as four other members there's six on that whole crew. ... So I think where are we? I think we're in good shape. If you said are you decentralized, are you school-based staff development I think with our program we're probably the forefront of most.

teacher: We've always sat down the administrator and I and shared what we've been doing with the coordinators and the staff when we come back from the meetings. I don't think the staff sees it or just yet see their role in it. I guess we haven't done a real good sell job at the school level where every day or every week we're getting new ideas.I

think it's a the coordinator level now and we have to bring it down to the teacher level.

teacher: I think the our goals for our school reflect probably one to two items that the staff has seen as a need. I think we try to have no more than four goals throughout the school for a year which I think they're general enough that we try to encompass a lot of disciplines within those particular goals.

teacher: There are some ideas that have been generated by us and we had discussed getting a speaker on social skills then we had that session.

Discussion

There seemed to be a general indication that school C was at Level III (Mechanical Use) as they were concerned with the day-to-day use of the program, attempting to meet user needs and to master tasks. Respondents tended to refer to "ideas" and "goals" that the staff had identified but there was a lack of unity

in their views regarding their involvement in the process.

The interview data indicated a diversity among the perceptions of the LoU of the administrator and the staff members. The administrator's perception of the LoU in the school varied dramatically from the perceived LoU of the teachers. The administrator perceived the school staff to be aware of the concept of school-based staff development and the program that was functioning in the school. The staff member involved in the leadership program perceived the awareness of the concept of school-based staff development to be at the coordinators level. The staff members interviewed indicated that they were aware of the term school-based staff development but their knowledge of the process was limited. The varied perceptions indicated a disjointed and superficial use of the innovation (Calvert and Crouse, 1987).

School D

School D is a senior high school.

administrator: We've set a focus of setting a focus for next year. We want to back up now and say let's get the big picture and do some trust building and idea sharing for what direction we should be going. We've polled the staff to ask the staff are you satisfied? What I did was give out a little survey to get them to rate us from one to ten on how effective our staff development has been. And there were I think six areas or five areas on how much input they feel they've had, on how effective we've been, how effective the sub committees, the large group stuff like that and I guess we scored over all an eight point seven out of ten or something like that for effectiveness.

teacher: Throughout this year we've established I believe three or four programs I'd have to check my records to be sure. We have a long range plan for each of those particular groups so we are well underway for next year.

teacher: We've already had some school-based stuff now and I know next year we will be having much more of it.

teacher: And what he has done is started off with just asking where our interests lie in developing some kind of professional development and from where the interests lie various committees were struck. The committees were then divided amongst the staff, each committee getting a chairperson and then they were able to meet at various times throughout the course of the year to try and establish some kind of school-based change in the way that p. d. is done, school-based activities for the school to make things run better. So I guess all that counts as p.d. From there the administration has agreed to allow these things to continue and for us to develop ideas and go with them and then hopefully next year have more days in which we can get together and develop more of our own activities rather than activities directed for us by the county or by the A.T.A.

Discussion

The interview data revealed some consensus among the respondents although there was a difference between participants in the leadership program and their staff in the LoU. The administrator and teacher involved in the pilot program were at Level VI (Refinement) as they were re-evaluating the quality of use of the program and exploring new goals for the school. They had surveyed the staff to determine the effectiveness of the first year of the program, had done long range planning and were looking at new goals and a new direction for the program in the following year. They were planning to move toward trust building and idea sharing to further advance the concept of school-based staff development.

The teachers interviewed who were not involved in the leadership program were at a lower LoU. They were aware of the school-based activities that had been presented during the current school year, had participated as a staff in the activities and were aware that there were plans to continue with school-based staff development activities however they did not indicate that they were aware of the focus for the next year. It would then appear that the staff members were

at Level V (Integration) as they were working with their staff as a group to improve the school climate but they were not concerned with the evaluation of the program.

The activities at the high school for the current year were focused on the improvement of the school climate and involved team building and goal setting for the entire staff. Wood (1989) sites this as one of the competencies required for a school-based staff development program (p. 39). The participation of the staff, as volunteer members of committees formed to address problems and identify solutions, was viewed by the respondents as a positive means of input into school policies and procedures.

Summary

Hall and Loucks state: "...there appeared to be different kinds of users and nonusers. Some were doing exciting things with an innovation while others were just stumbling along with it on a day-to-day basis" (Hall and Loucks, 1982, p. 144). This statement was generally confirmed by the interview data as the LoU of participants varied among the administrators, the

teachers and the schools. The variety of the LoU provided a challenge in determining a LoU for each individual school. The interview data indicated that all schools involved in the pilot program knew about the innovation, had acquired the information and had prepared for and were using the innovation. The participants operating at the lowest LoU were at Level III, (Mechanical Use), as their focus was on day-to-day use of the innovation with changes being made to meet teacher needs. The participants at the highest LoU were at Level VI, (Renewal), as their focus was the re-evaluation of their use of the innovation and the exploration of new goals for the school. The interview data generally indicated the LoU in the elementary schools were more consistent among staff members than the LoU in the junior and senior high schools.

One of the perceptions that arose from the analysis of the interview data was the larger the school the less consensus between participants in the pilot program and their respective staffs in regard to LoU. The data indicated that the teachers functioning within an organizational structure based on departments were at a lower LoU of the program. The elementary school

respondents were aware of the innovation and the direction that the school was taking and both leadership participants and their staff members tended to be at the same LoU . As mentioned before this could be due in part to the generalist nature of teaching at the elementary school level. The junior and senior high school respondents were less aware of the direction of the school and the staff members LoU tended to vary from that of the leadership participants. This could be a result of a greater dependence on line rather than staff communication or less overall communication due to the size of the junior and senior high schools and the resulting increase in the number of people on staff.

The school with the highest LoU for both leadership participants and their staff members had focused on the improvement of school climate for their initial school-based staff development activities an approach also mentioned in the literature (Arin-Krupp, 1989; Hall and Loucks, 1979; Levine and Broude, 1989; Loucks-Horsley, 1989; McLaughlin and Marsh, 1979). All of the staff members volunteered for the committee they were interested in working with. This activity provided a positive environment and enabled staff members the opportunity to get to know each other, identify

problems, participate in group decision making and problem solving, see the strengths of and give support to their peers. The staff as a group produced policies and procedures to benefit the school as a whole.

Chapter V

SUMMARY, RECOMMENDATIONS, SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH AND CONCLUSION

This study involved an analysis of the perceptions of administrators and teachers involved in the pilot program, *Leadership in Staff Development* and the perceptions of their respective staff members regarding the implementation of school-based staff development in Strathcona County. The goals of the study were to describe what happened to professional development in the schools as the participants progressed through the program and to provide an indication of the levels of use of the program.

The interview data of selected staff members were analyzed and quoted in the study to describe administrator and teacher perceptions with regard to professional development. The interview data were also used to determine levels of use of the training program.

Summary

The perceptions of administrators and teachers involved in the study were analyzed to determine trends, similarities and differences in school-based staff development programs in schools participating in the Leadership in Professional Development Program.

Leadership in Professional Development Program - Level One

The interview findings indicated the goals for level one of the program have been met. The participants in the program were aware of the essential components of staff development, cognizant of the leadership skills they had developed and had practised using those skills with their respective staffs.There was a staff committee involved in professional development in each school in the pilot program and all schools had a professional development plan in place for the following year. The leadership program participants had also developed a collegial network with their peers.

Summary of Responses to Interview Questions

All teachers and administrators interviewed indicated a knowledge of the school-based staff development program, although the program participants were much more specific in their descriptions of both the purpose of the program and the type of program that was to be offered. The participants in the leadership program were also aware of the goals and direction of the program in their schools for the next year while the members of their respective staffs generally assumed that the program would be continuing but did not indicate specific goals.

The findings also indicated that the teachers were aware there was a change in staff development at their schools and that a new program was being implemented. The respondents indicated they were pleased with their increased input into decisions regarding staff development and viewed this as a positive way to meet their professional development needs. The teachers involved in the leadership program generally indicated an awareness of the change from a top down to bottom up emphasis in staff development and there was a general acceptance by all respondents of the top down emphasis

for the training of leaders. The aspect of lead teacher training was supported by both trained and untrained respondents.

The findings generally indicate the administrators and teachers were aware of the need for a change in the process of staff development as the current programs were not meeting the needs of the teachers in the system. There was a perception that teacher dissatisfaction was the reason for lack of staff "buy in" and poor attendance at system in-services. The interview data generally indicated that the teachers perceived their needs were better met through the school-based program.

The analysis of the interview data generally indicated that the respondents found school-based staff development to be a positive learning experience as it had given them the opportunity to work with the entire staff as a means of improving and moving ahead as a group rather than individuals. The respondents also indicated an increase in sharing and interaction among staff members which was perceived as positive by both the staff leaders and their respective members. The respondents generally perceived that the senior

administration in Strathcona County was a aware of research literature as well as the current trends in the area of staff development and was attempting to meet the needs of the teachers in the system. This was also viewed in a positive manner.

The analysis of the data indicated that the amount of time required to implement school-based staff development varied among respondents. The larger schools had contributed more time to the implementation of their programs which could be attributed to the difficulty in communication with a larger staff or to the emphasis on line rather than staff communication. Those not involved in the leadership program were much less aware of the time the implementation required as they were not directly involved. The data indicated staff leaders perceived the time required to implement the program as worthwhile.

The interview data revealed a variety of concerns from the respondents but there was some consensus among the staff leaders regarding the provision of time and money for the continuation of the program. Also perceived as concerns were: the need for trust between the staff and the administration, the lack of "buy in"

by some staff members, the need for staff members to maintain their level of energy and enthusiasm, the tradition of privacy in the field of teaching and the aging teaching population. It is normal for people to have informational and personal concerns during the initiation phase of an innovation as they need time to develop a clear image of the change being implemented and how it will affect them.

The differences that arose when comparing interview data of the participants in the leadership program with that of their staff members indicated that the two groups were at different stages of concern regarding the future plans of school-based staff development. This is also an expected outcome in relation to the change process as those involved with the pilot program are more familiar with the content and are therefore at a higher level of use in regard the program.

The interview data generally indicated administrator and teacher support for the school-based staff development program. The data showed consensus for termination of the program if there was a withdrawal or lack of central office support or lack of teacher interest. The data indicated that the administrators and

teachers involved in the pilot schools were committed to the change from system to school-based staff development and they could not think of any reason that either the staff or the senior administration would want to terminate the program. The participants perceived the change in staff development as a positive and important step in motivating teachers and improving teacher morale.

Other Results

The analysis of the interview data revealed a number of concepts which are consistent with the literature on planned change in staff development. The respondents indicated the importance of teacher centered and school-based staff development programs as an opportunity for teachers to identify their needs and to plan to meet those needs.

The importance of administrative support in the success of the school-based programs was also indicated as a reason for the perceived success of the school-based programs during the year. The respondents attributed much of the progress made to the support and

involvement of their administration. There was however a perceived lack of support from some of the instructional services staff in terms of personal involvement and support for school-based activities. The respondents indicated there was a need for a review of role descriptions for instructional services staff to facilitate the change in activities as a result of the innovations in the area of staff development. The respondents perceived the mix of school-based and system staff development activities as positive and were appreciative of the availability of the expertise of the instructional services staff.

There was evidence of increased insight as to the scope and challenge of the change process and recognition of the need for educators to be life long learners as a result of the initiatives undertaken by the participants in the leadership program. The respondents also expressed an awareness that not all staff members were willing to participate in the school-based program. The leadership program provided the participants with the opportunity to become leaders in the change process and their increased insight into the complex process of change indicates the extent of the

professional learning they have developed as a result of the leadership training.

The perception that elementary school teachers were better able to adapt to the school-based staff development program also arose from the analysis of the data. Elementary school teachers are perceived to be more generalist in terms of the school curriculum than junior and senior high school teachers and the elementary schools are on the average smaller than junior and senior high schools so there is greater potential for communication among staff members.

Levels of Use of the Program

The interview data indicated the LoU of participants varied among the administrators, the teachers and the schools. The respondents indicated that all participants involved in the pilot program knew about the innovation, had acquired the information and had prepared for and were using the innovation. The participants operating at the lowest LoU were at Level III, (Mechanical Use), as their focus was on day-to-day use of the innovation with changes being made to meet

teacher needs. The participants at the highest LoU were at Level VI, (Renewal), as their focus was the re-evaluation of their use of the innovation and the exploration of new goals for the school. The interview data generally indicated the LoU in the elementary schools were more consistent among staff members than the LoU among the teachers in the junior and senior high schools.

The analysis of the data generally indicated the larger the school the less consensus between participants in the pilot program and their respective staffs in regard to LoU. The teachers functioning within an organizational structure based on departments were at a lower LoU in the program. The elementary school respondents were aware of the innovation and the direction that the school was taking. The junior and senior high school respondents were less aware of the direction of the school. This could be a result of a greater dependence on line rather than staff communication or less overall communication due to the the size of the school and the number of people in the school.

Ultimately the aim of school-based staff development is to have teachers coaching teachers as a means of improving technical skills in the classroom. The respondents were concerned about how the program would affect them and had not yet progressed to concern about the impact the program would have in terms of benefit to their students.

Recommendations

The results of this study indicate the implementation of school-based staff development should be continued for the educators in Strathcona County. The following recommendations, for the senior administration of Strathcona County, are made as a result of the findings of the study to ensure the successful implementation of the innovation.

1. The implementation of school-based staff development is perceived by the participants in the pilot program to be a positive way in which to meet the professional development needs of the teachers in the County. Administrators and teachers involved in level one of the program should be required to complete all levels of the leadership program. Administrators and teachers from schools not involved in the pilot program must be encouraged to become involved in level one of the leadership program in the fall of 1992.

2. There was a concern that arose from the analysis of the data regarding the provision of time and funding to support the continuation of school-based staff development programs. The Strathcona County Board of

Education and the senior administration must provide some type of assurance that time and money will be provided on an ongoing basis to maintain the implementation of school-based staff development.

3. There was a concern expressed in the participant responses that there was a lack of support for the change to school-based staff development by some members of the instructional services department. The role descriptions of the instructional services department must be reviewed and revised to meet the change in role requirements as a result of the implementation of the school-based staff development programs. Staff development and instructional services departments must work collaboratively to facilitate the change from system to school-based staff development.

4. One of the perceptions that arose from the analysis of the interview data was the larger the school the less consensus between participants in the pilot program and their respective staffs in regard to LoU. This finding indicates the need for the number of participants in the leadership program to be based on the total number of teachers in the school rather than a set number of participants regardless of the size of the school. The

training of more lead teachers in the larger schools would increase communication, LoU, and would increase the probability of the implementation of the innovation, school-based staff development.

Possibilities for Further Research

As the study progressed some ideas arose for further research that might be useful to those studying the implementation of school-based staff development programs.

Research using a questionnaire survey and involving large groups of participants in school-based staff development programs would provide data regarding perceptions of the effectiveness of the program in relation to the implementation of school-based staff development. The findings would be more widely generalizable and would also provide further evaluation related to direction of the program in terms of modifications or continuance.

The focused interview is the method recommended to determine the LoU of individuals, however the interview

format would be enhanced by the use of a questionnaire survey of all the participants involved in the pilot program to determine the perceived LoU for all the schools. This would provide a means of generalizing the data from the study as well as providing further triangulation.

A descriptive study following the participants involved in the second year of the staff development program and their progress in the implementation of school-based staff development in their respective schools would be of value to the senior administration in Strathcona County and the Alberta Teachers' Association. The study could be used as an further evaluative instrument for both groups in terms of direction of the programs.

Conclusion

The researcher attempted to answer two questions. The first question was: What happens regarding professional development in the respective schools as these teachers progress through the leadership program? As the teachers involved in the leadership program progressed through the program they became aware of the essential components of staff development, cognizant of the leadership skills they had developed, and used those skills with their staff. The participants also mentioned that they had developed a collegial network. The participants indicated that they found the experience to be positive and rewarding. There was an increase in the participation of their respective staffs in the planning and preparation of staff development activities which resulted in a generally positive response to the implementation of school-based staff development.

The second question was: Did the training of lead teachers facilitate the formation of a school-based professional development plan in their school? The schools that took part in the leadership program did form a staff development committee and a school-based staff development plan in their schools. The plans are

at different Levels of Use and vary in content and approach but there are plans in place in all participating schools for next year.

Bibliography

Alberta Teachers' Association. (1988). *Leadership in professional development*. Edmonton: Alberta Teachers' Association.

Arin-Krupp, J. (1989). Staff development and the individual.In S. Caldwell (Ed.), *Staff development: A handbook of effective practices* (pp. 44-57). Oxford, OH: National Staff Development Council.

Barth, R. (1991). *Improving schools from within.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Inc.

Beegle, C. and Edelfelt, R. (Eds.). (1977). *Staff development: Staff liberation.* Washington, D. C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Berg, B. (1989). *Qualitative research methods for the social sciences*. Needham Heights, MA.: Allyn and Bacon.

Berman, P. (1978).The study of macro- and micro implementation. *Public Policy*, 26 (2), 157-184.

Burke, P. (1987). *Teacher development*. East Sussex, UK: The Falmer Press.

Caldwell, S. (Ed). (1989). *Staff development: A handbook of effective practices*. Oxford, OH: National Staff Development Council.

Caldwell, S. and Marshall, J. (1982). Staff development-four approaches described, assessed for practitioner, theoretician. *NASSP Bulletin*, February, pp. 25-35. Reston:VA.:National Association of Secondary School Principals.

Caldwell, S. and Wood, F. (1981). Inservice readiness: do we have the cart before the horse. *The Developer*. Oxford, OH.: National Staff Development Council.

Calvert, L. and Crouse, K. (1987). *Growth by design: Staff development practices for effective schools.* Don Mills, ON: Professional Development Committee, Ontario Secondary School Teachers' Federation.

"Critical attributes of effective teacher development programs". (1987). *Continuing to learn: a guidebook for teacher development.* The Regional Laboratory for Educational Improvement of the Northeast and Islands.

Doll, R. (1983). *Supervision for staff development: ideas and application.* Newton, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Drader, C. (1990). *A comparison of centralized and site-based approaches to the professional development of teachers.* Unpublished master's thesis,University of Alberta.

Fullan, M. and Stiegelbauer, S. (1991). *The new meaning of educational change.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Hall, G. and Loucks, S. (1979). Teacher concerns as a basis for facilitating and personalizing staff development. In A. Lieberman and L. Miller (Eds.), *Staff development new demands, new realities, new perspectives* (pp. 36-53). New York, NY: Teachers College.

Hall, G. and Loucks, S. (1982). Bridging the gap: Policy research rooted in practice.In Lieberman and McLaughlin (Eds.), *Policy making in education: Eighty-first yearbook of the national society for the study of education part 1* (pp.133-158). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Harris, B. (1980). *Improving staff performance through in-service education.* Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Harris, B. (1989). *In-service education for staff development.* Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Hewton, E. (1988). *School focused staff development*. Philadelphia, PA.: Falmer Press.

Levine, S. and Broude, N. (1989). Designs for learning. In S. Caldwell (Ed.), *Staff development: A handbook of effective practices* (pp.70-83). Oxford, OH: National Staff Development Council.

Lieberman, A. (1982). Practice makes policy: The tensions of school improvement. In A. Lieberman and McLaughlin (Eds.), *Policy making in education: Eighty-first yearbook of the national society for the study of education part 1* (pp249-269). Chicago, IL.:University of Chicago Press.

Lieberman, A. and Miller, L. (Eds.). (1979). *Staff development new demands, new realities, new perspectives*. New York, NY: Teachers College.

Loucks-Horsley, S., Harding, C., Arbuckle, M., Murray, L., Dubea, C., and Williams, M. (1987). *Continuing to learn a guidebook for teacher development*. U.S.A.: The Regional Laboratory for Educational

Improvement of the Northeast and Islands and National Staff Development Council.

Loucks-Horsley, S. (1989). Managing change: An integrated part of staff development.In S. Caldwell (Ed), *Staff development: A handbook of effective practices* (pp. 114- 125). Oxford, OH: National Staff Development Council

Louis, K. (1989). The role of the district in improvement. In M. Holmes, K. Leithwood and D. Musella (Eds.), *Educational policy for effective schools* (pp. 145-167). Toronto, Ont.: OISE Press.

Marshall, J. (1989). Assessing program effects.In S. Caldwell (Ed.), *Staff development: A handbook of effective practices* (pp. 92-113). Oxford. OH: National Staff Development Council.

McLaughlin, M. and Marsh, D. (1979). Staff development and school change. In A. Lieberman and L. Miller (Eds.), *Staff development new demands, new realities, new perspectives* (pp. 69-94). New York, NY: Teachers College.

Metzdorf, J. (1989). District-level staff development. In S. Caldwell (Ed.), *Staff development: A handbook of effective practices.* (pp. 14-24). Oxford, OH: National Staff Development Council.

Miles, M. (1980). School innovation from the ground up: Some dilemas. *New York University Education Quarterly*, 11 (2), 2-9. New York, NY.: School of Education New York University.

Pansegrau, M. (1983). *Teachers' perspectives on inservice education.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Alberta.

Pelton, M. (1983). *Staff development in small and rural school districts.* Arlington, VA: The American Association of Schools Administrators.

Showers, B. (1983). *The transfer of training: the contribution of coaching.* Eugene, OR: Center for Educational Policy and Management.

Rubin, L. (1978). *Perspectives on preservice and inservice education.* Syracuse, NY: National Council of States on Inservice Education.

Rogers, E. (1962). *Diffusion of innovations.* New York: Free Press of Glencoe.

Sparks, G. and Schiff, S. (1986). A triangle model of staff development.*The Developer* .May. pp.11-12. Oxford, OH.: National Staff Development Council.

Strathcona County Board of Education (1990). *Towards 2000 shaping our future.* Unpublished Strategic Plan. Sherwood Park, Alberta.

Turnbull, B. (1984). States propose, schools dispose: prospects for state initiatives in quality improvement. *Education and urban society*,16(2),207-224.

Welch, G., Thomas, D., Lowery, B., Anderson, A., Boddy, D., Haydon-Jones, C., Nielson, B., Nicholson,

E.,and Lynn, D. (1990). *Staff development for the 1990's*. Alberta: C. A. S. S. Education Committee.

Williams, R. (1979). A political perspective on staff development. In A. Lieberman and L. Miller (Eds.), *Staff development new demands, new realities, new perspectives* (pp. 95-106). New York, NY: Teachers College.

Wood, F. (1989). Organizing and managing school-based staff development. In C. Caldwell (Ed.), *Staff development: A handbook of effective practices*. (pp 26-43). Oxford, OH: National Staff Development Council.

Appendix A

Interview Questions

Interview Questions

The interview questions for the teachers and administrators were as follows:

1. What do you know about the "Leadership in Professional Development" program?

2. Does the approach in this program differ from the approach to staff development currently in use in your school or is it similar?

3. In your view, what are the reasons this program is being implemented?

4. What does the program mean to or for you?

5. When are you planning to implement this program in your school?

6. How much time is it taking?

7. What are your concerns regarding this program?

8. Where are you today in your planning with regard to the program?

9. What would cause you to terminate this process?

Appendix B

Covering Letter for the Study

March 19, 1992

Dear Gordon,

Further to our conversation in early February, I have received approval from the ethics review committee at the University of Alberta. I have enclosed a copy of the documents I submitted to the committee.

I have also enclosed a copy of the questions that I propose to use when I interview teachers. This list has been approved by my advisor, Dr. D. A. MacKay however I would appreciate any changes, additions or deletions you feel appropriate.

I would like permission to contact the principals in the following schools to request their cooperation in facilitating interviews with members of their respective staffs. The schools are: ... I would like to start interviewing during spring break if possible.

Sincerely,

Joan L. Souster

Appendix C

Covering Letter to the Principals

Dear Principal,

I am presently working on a master's thesis at the University of Alberta and have been given permission by our superintendent, Gordon Welch, to contact you regarding my data collection.

My study involves describing the early stages of school-based staff development. The perceptions of teachers, administrators and members of their respective staffs involved in the leadership in Professional development Program will be described as well as the levels of use of the program.

I would like to interview the administrator and the staff member involved in the training program as well as two other teachers in your school. Please reply using InBox with the names of the people who have expressed an interest in participating in the interview. I will contact the administrator and the three teachers to set up interview times that are convenient for them.

The information gained from this study will be made available to you and should be useful to your staff. I look forward to your reply.

Sincerely

Joan Souster

Appendix D

Sample Interview Script

Interview 10. School A.

1. **What do you know about the "Leadership in Professional Development" program?**

Well as a founding participant I guess I have some knowledge. I started with our staff rep back in September and have been involved in all the sessions. It's a training program for school-based staff development. Um a series of exercises and knowledge on how to involve and empower staffs to become involved in their own staff development.

2. **How does the approach in this program differ from or is it similar to the approach to staff development currently in use in your school?**

I think it's more organized, it's a model we'll say that teachers or staff development can take and use to organize staffs to have staffs get involved. Prior to what we've been doing this year it was probably a top down kind of staff development where administrators or central office identified areas and then we used that time within the school to do activities or to bring in speakers with the staff. So I think it becomes more a grass roots um starting from the bottom, starting where the teachers are and developing a plan for staff development.

Well it's similar in that the decisions are being made for a good part of the time by staffs identifying needs uh to appoint setting priorities and then people

within the staff setting out and searching out expertise in the areas.

3. **In your view, what are the reasons this program is being implemented?**

A perception that their staff development was going nowhere. They had done a poor job identifying what staffs want and need uh it was based on the premise that everybody needed the same thing and every staff is different. Our staff would probably be radically different than (another school) staff and (another school) and what they're doing in their school has some merit probably in our school but it's not our priority.

4. **What does the program mean to or for you?**

Well as the administrator in charge of the responsibility of getting this thing off the ground I appreciate having some knowledge in the approach that I can take with my staff in uh making them feel this isn't a laid on program. This is something for their benefit, that professional improvement is the wave of the future and they'd better get with the program.

5. **When are you planning to implement this program in your school?**

It's already implemented. (Other representative) and I have really started, I guess we started back prior to Christmas with an initial needs survey. We identified some areas, or the staff identified some areas, that they'd like to work on. We put together a staff development day uh the March in-service day wasn't school-based but we have since refined our priorities

and set some goals for the October in-service. And we'll be having a couple of people coming in, to do uh some sessions as identified by the staff as areas that they'd like to look at.

6. **How much time is it taking?**

That's a good question. Uh, I'm on the phone a lot but only talking to other people, other staff representatives, talking about their staff development. I had a lot of difficulty pinning down (instructional services staff) in particular um there was a reluctance on their part to commit to that staff development day and that was a source of frustration to me because there seems to be a uh a conflict between staff development and instructional services. There seems to be some tugging right now and they're not sure, and I'm saying staff development or uh instructional services, I don't think have their roles defined uh as of yet in terms of staff development.

Now that's the bad news, the good news is that I did finally get them to come in. But I think there are some growing pains going on and I think there is some ... well I don't know if it's a power play or is it just a confusion as to roles.

7. **What are your concerns regarding this program?**

I personally don't have any concerns uh I have, my outlook is uh I think realistic in the sense that we have uh I think deadened people's sensitivity to staff development over the years. We have made people feel that it is a one or two days a year and you have lunch and you meet people and if you happen to get something

out of the sessions great. And I think it's going to take some time for people to realize that hey uh this is not laid on this is what you want. Uh this a program that's going to make you a better person as a teacher and uh it's going to take a while for the people I think to, I mean, and I say the majority of people uh to really get into this and really get excited about it and see the value of it.

Do you have some people on your staff who aren't excited about it?

Yeah, I'd say that's fair. Um, the comments have been I think generally the comments have been good. Uh, pleasantly surprized I think they, we are actually planning days for ourselves for this staff. Uh and uh spending it the way we want. The people that aren't excited are in my judgement the people who aren't excited about the profession. And whether you stood up and spit nickels or um did a dance on the staff development is not a priority to them.

8. **Where are you today in your planning with regard to the program?**

We have, as I mentioned before, we have set or made plans for the October in-service. We have identified some areas that will be looked at in an ongoing way. Um I guess in that sense we have some goals for next year. We are going to be concentrating on a couple of areas and we have the commitment I think from the staff so I think we're in good shape.

9. What would cause you to terminate this process?

Gee that's a pretty radical move. If we're speaking hypothetically I guess if uh we were we found there was no support coming from Central Office whether it be uh in terms of funding or in terms of recognition that staff development is important and consequently teachers do require time to be in-serviced. If it reverted back to too much laid on kind of programs top down I think those would be reasons to terminate.

Do you have any concluding comments? Anything you would like to add?

Well, you know, I don't find and I think many elementary people do not find this process foreign. I think for years elementary people have been doing a lot of this kind of stuff. It may not have had a name, it may not have been really organized, but we have been making a lot of decisions in terms of in-servicing and staff development and I think partially because elementary people are required to be versatile in so many areas. So staff development is important. It's pretty difficult to stay on top of all the curricular changes for all the different areas. So I guess I find this process very easy and I think elementary teachers especially will be very comfortable with this kind of a process.

That they are generalists and always comfortable with school-based, because we have been doing it, we may not have called it that, but that's what we were doing. When we banked our two or three minutes a day and had our once a month there was always something planned. As

I said it probably wasn't as organized as, as much thought put into it, the prior thought and goals and planning but the bottom line is we were doing it so people feel comfortable with it. And I think people are happy to come back to it. I don't think our people see this as a change it's just a revert back to what was probably going reasonably well at one time.